DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 841 JC 820 107

AUTHOR Hamblin, Fred, Ed.
TITLE Critical Issues in College System Management: Conference Proceedings (Toronto, Ontario, October, 1981).
INSTITUTION Association of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario, Willowdale.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 223p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Delivery Systems; *Educational Change; Educational Development; *Educational Finance; *Educational Objectives; Foreign Countries; Resource Allocation; State Colleges; *Statewide Planning; Technical Institutes; *Technological Advancement; *Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Ontario

ABSTRACT

These proceedings contain all of the formal presentations made at a conference focusing on policy issues affecting the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario. Introductory remarks by Harry Fisher are followed by an outline by Blair Tully of the Ontario government's focus on high technology and the projects of the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development. Panel discussions focus on: (1) "Program Objectives in the High Technology Era" (chair: William Newnham; panelists: A. S. Aidelbaum, Donald Pollock, and Archie Turner); (2) "Program Delivery in a Changing Environment" (panelists: George Farrow, Riske Taher, and Diana Schatz; (3) "Resource Allocation and Maximization" (chair: Doug Light; panelists: Charles Johnston and John Humber); (4) "The Development of a Responsive System" (chair: Charles Pascal; panelists: William Case, Norman Williams, William Cruden, and Ken Hunter); and (5) "Developing Alternative Strategies" (panelists: David Sutherland, Michael Skolnik, Doug Light, and Charles Pascal). Additionally, the proceedings contain presentations by Bill Fox on the expansion and improvement of industrial training; by Ian Macdonald on the economic situation in Canada and the role of postsecondary education in economic growth; and by Bette Stephenson on the importance of lifelong learning in a changing society. (LAL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Hamblin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED235841

JC 820 107

Critical Issues in College System Management

Edited by:

Fred Hamblin
Executive Director
ACAATO

Published by:

The Association of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario

CRITICAL ISSUES IN COLLEGE SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

Edited by:

Fred Hamblin
Executive Director
ACAATO

Published by:

The Association of Colleges of Applied Arts
and Technology of Ontario

COPYRIGHT © 1982

by

The Association of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario
Box 55, 2 Sheppard Avenue East, Suite 703
Willowdale, Ontario
M2N 5Y7

"The greatest and most dangerous turbulence today results from the collision between the delusions of the decision makers and the realities. But a time of turbulence is also one of great opportunity for those who can understand, accept and exploit new realities. It is above all a time of opportunity for leadership".

Peter Drucker
Managing in
Turbulent Times

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction and Acknowledgements.....	
Opening Session	
Dr.Harry Fisher.....	3
Blair Tully.....	9
Program Objectives in the High Technology Era	
Dr. William Newnham	23
A.S. Aidelbaum.....	29
Donald Pollock.....	39
Archie Turner.....	49
Program Delivery in a Changing Environment	
George Farrow.....	59
Dr. Riske Taher.....	71
Dr. Diana Schatz.....	77
Resource Allocation and Maximization	
Doug Light.....	87
Dr. Charles Johnston.....	95
John Humber.....	101
Friday Luncheon	
Bill Fox.....	113
The Development of a Responsive System	
Dr. Charles Pascal.....	127
William Case.....	139
Norman Williams.....	143
William Cruden.....	153
Ken Hunter.....	159
Friday Dinner	
Dr. Ian Macdonald.....	167

Developing Alternative Strategies

David Sutherland..... 189
Michael Skolnik..... 195
Doug Light..... 205
Dr. Charles Pascal 211

Closing Luncheon

Hon. Dr. Bette Stephenson..... 219

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In October of 1981 a conference on "Critical Issues in College System Management" was held in Toronto, Ontario. The Conference represented the first time in the fifteen year history of the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario that representatives of the Boards of Governors and Council of Regents came together with the Presidents and senior Ministry personnel to discuss policy issues.

The fact that such a diverse group could come together at all was due to the excellent work and co-operation of the Conference Steering Committee under the very able direction of its Chairman, Dr. Harry K. Fisher, Deputy Minister of Colleges and Universities for Ontario.

Working with Dr. Fisher were:

Mr. Norman Williams,
Chairman,
Ontario Council of Regents

Mr. Ben Wilson,
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Colleges and Universities

Mr. Bill Case,
President
Association of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario

Mr. Bill Cruden,
President
St. Lawrence College, and
Chairman of the Committee of Presidents

Mr. Ken Hunter
Assistant Deputy Minister
Skills Development Division

From all accounts the Conference was deemed a tremendous success. Not only did the key figures within the College System have an opportunity to get to know one another on a less formal basis, but they had a unique opportunity to share views and perceptions on a wide variety of matters that are of critical importance to the CAAT System.

While it was not possible to capture all of the views that were expressed by the participants, the following represents all of the formal presentations -- including session summaries -- that were presented on the final day under the heading, Developing Alternative Strategies.

A Conference such as this could not, of course, be organized without the dedicated support of many behind the scenes workers.

On behalf of the participants, I would like to thank the Group Facilitators, namely; Brian Desbiens (St. Clair), Paul Lassaline (Sir Sandford Fleming). Charles Pascal and Michael Skolnik (Ontario Institute for Studies in Education), and David Wroe (Cambrian).

In addition, I would like to extend my personal appreciation to Marilyn Pattison, Pat Brown, Pat Capitano and Sheila Garrity for their unstinting co-operation.

Lastly, I would like especially to thank my secretary, Nancy Brooks, for her patience, patience, and more patience in typing and re-typing the many pages which follow.

Fred Hamblin
Conference Co-ordinator

Willowdale, Ontario
January, 1982

OPENING SESSION

Chairman: Dr. Harry Fisher
Deputy Minister
Ministry of Colleges
and Universities

Speaker: Blair Tully
Secretary
Board of Industrial Leadership
and Development

DR. HARRY K. FISHER, DEPUTY MINISTER,
MINISTRY OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

We thank you very much Fred and the members of the Steering Committee. This has been the most delegated responsibility activity that I have ever been associated with and I must say I am encouraged by the situation so far. Thank you for all your work, and help, in putting this conference together.

In a few minutes, we will start to engage in an exploration of the critical issues in college system management. But before we do, as your Chairman, it's my responsibility to present a few remarks to you about our conference objectives and our conference working topics.

Over the next two days we will be challenged to do two things. First of all, we must try to identify, define, and improve our understanding of the issues that are critical now and in the near future. Secondly we're going to try to put these issues into the context of a constantly evolving college system.

Reaching an understanding of the principles that under-pin our two challenges is critically more important -- and certainly infinitely more difficult -- than leaping to the attractiveness of possible immediate solutions. And that, of course, is a tendancy that happens to us at conferences like this where we're somewhat removed from the reality of our daily

existence. Our mission then, requires some discipline on our part, and over the next two days we may very well have to remind ourselves of the first principles of our exploration.

May I just touch briefly on the conference topics that are going to form the basis of the sessions which we will be attending. The first one will deal with Program Objectives in the High Technology Era. Blair Tully is going to outline for us the Government's present focus on the high-tech area, and in so doing will remind us of the primacy that this issue holds for Ontario's future. All of us, in considering this program spotlight, are sensitive to, and conditioned to, the fleeting, transitory and evolving aura that accompanies the high-tech field; today's IBM 55-20 is tomorrow's history display in the Science Centre. We are conscious too, I think, of the insatiable lust for skills and talents that high technology brings to the labour market.

In coping from the perspective of the colleges, we must surely remind ourselves, while discussing this topic, of our first responsibilities to those who cannot cope, who are not suited, or who opt out of engaging with the maw of high technology. So we turn to our second topic then -- Program Delivery in a Changing Environment. Here we will wrestle with some

principles which will challenge the basic pedagogy of our program presentations in the light of the possibilities that are brought to us from the teaching and learning dynamics of the new information technology.

How wired will we become? Most presidents now feel strung out, but how wired are we going to become? What are the basic competencies that we will identify in the future in our staffs? What are the basic life long learning competencies to be developed in our students? What are the key issues in the cross-over program delivery strategies in the entire post-secondary field? How do we feel about our college environment today against our best guess about tomorrow?

Much of our life together over the past few years has been dominated by the agony, with little ecstacy, of our period of adjustment in a fiscally restrained environment. Financial issues, appropriately set out on green paper in the background materials that were sent to you, form a basis for our discussions in Seminar Number Three, Resource Allocation and Maximization. Here we will deal with many of the key principles of fiscal reality. Let me say that I have complete faith in the managerial leadership

demonstrated during the colleges' initial developmental history. It will have its finest hour during the eighties as we cope with our resource management problems.

Fourthly, the colleges have been from the outset and from first principles, a responsive system. We have much to respond to. Today and in the eighties, "there are many significant deficiencies and gaps which remain to be overcome, especially with respect to research; the retraining of workers, and the development of highly skilled manpower".

I didn't say that. Dr. John Deutsch said that to the Canadian Club in Toronto on March 1st, 1965. And William G. Davis referred to that remark when he introduced, on May 21st, 1965 the operational system designed for the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. Mr. Davis, on the same occasion, said that the colleges should be viewed in the light of the economic and social demands, not only of today, but of tommorow. The basic principle of responsiveness and its management is a key critical issue for our deliberations.

One final point. It has been my privilege for a period of weekends and evenings, over six months, to be associated with a number of people from Ontario, who explored together the future of Ontario's universities. This conference in the same way, marks

the start of a significant and important dialogue on the future of our Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. As the government's Chief Executive Officer responsible for both sectors, as well as the dynamics of the Federal-Provincial relationship in education, I often, perhaps wistfully, reflect upon the wholeness, the Gestalt, if you will, of the entire post-secondary or higher education system. Sometime soon, maybe today, we're going to have to talk together about that system in it's entirety. Our efforts over the next few days, must be taken seriously indeed, and I don't want my Presbyterian background to cloud the enthusiasm by stressing the seriousness of our purpose together. We do have an outstanding opportunity to point the way to the future, to marshal our personal commitments, and there isn't anyone here who does not have that commitment to the system as we now know it, and to discover together the way ahead.

There may well be one final, fundamental principle that we should recognize at this stage, and that is the principle that the after-dinner speaker should begin as closely as possible to the cigar lighting.

I offer my personal greetings once again to all of you, and my sincerest best wishes to you, and to us, for a most successful conference about the future of the great system of colleges in this Province of Ontario.

BLAIR TULLY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF INDUSTRIAL LEADERSHIP AND DEVELOPMENT

Thank you very much Ben, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen. It is indeed my pleasure to be here with you. After hearing an introduction like that, I'm sometimes tempted to go back and change my resume somewhat. I feel that all the progress over the past few years has indicated more an incapacity to hold down a job for very long, as opposed to any innate talents that I might have.

It has been an interesting period of years, and as you indicated, it has given me an opportunity to see the economic development process in action from many perspectives, and to discuss issues of tremendous importance to the Province in the area of economic development with a great number of players in that process.

The topic which your Chairman has assigned to me, and assigned to all of us over the next two days, is a discussion of critical issues. This topic certainly ensures that there will be no shortage of things to discuss and I would expect, as Harry indicated, that discussions will go on late into the evening. The perspective that I would like to put on these discussions today really relates to the role -- the

relationship between education and the economy. I bring this perspective from the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development and my most recent appointment.

BILD, as many of you know, was first announced by the Treasurer, The Honourable Frank Miller, last November as a major initiative in his mini budget -- supplementary measures to stimulate the Ontario economy. BILD is a Committee of Cabinet, charged with marshalling the resources of the Ontario Government towards the implementation of an over-all program of industrial expansion and economic development. The responsibilites of BILD are pretty broad in nature: To consolidate and co-ordinate the Government's total economic development effort; to provide a focus for economic liaison with the Federal government and other concerned interests; and to ensure the maximum participation in, and support for, Ontario's priority initiatives.

The BILD Ministers have identified six major areas as priority for the Province's economic development: electricty, transportation, resources, technology, people and community. At this point we have eighty-five projects in various stages of development, ranging from a program to encourage asparagus

production to the IDEA Corporation -- a new approach to linking the research potential of Ontario's excellent public institutions with the commercial opportunities and production facilities of the private sector.

All of the BILD projects, including the program to encourage asparagus production and the IDEA Corporation, are part of the Ontario Government's response to the changing economic environment. It is an environment that among other things requires us to take advantage of opportunities for import substitution -- Ontario-grown asparagus in place of California-grown asparagus -- and to unleash the combined creative potential for research and development in our industry, government and post-secondary institutions. Because many of the critical issues before this conference amount to a recognition of a need for post-secondary education to respond to changes in our economic environment, I would like to spend a little time discussing some of the important environmental factors and their significance.

The impact of the energy crisis is pervasive, in addition to the obvious and immediate price effects. The sharp increase in energy prices in the early seventies had a number of important consequences for the next decade. Higher energy prices have set plans in motion for the major energy related investment projects in the 1980's and beyond. These in turn have

important implications for future labour force skill requirements. Our energy prices have led to a growth explosion in the energy rich Western Provinces. This has led to increased migration from Ontario to the west, and a decrease of the flow into Ontario from other Provinces. Higher wages that are attracting migrants to the Western Provinces are adding to the pressure on Ontario firms to increase wages. Such wage increases will have the effect of making Ontario's traditional manufacturing sector less competititive internationally, which in turn could contribute to the restructuring of the Ontario economy. Higher energy prices have accelerated the obsolescence of our capital stock. The machinery, for example, in the North American auto industry was intended to make large cars, and has subsequently become obsolete -- somewhat earlier than the industry had originally planned. Machinery and equipment bought in contemplation of a continuation of an environment of relatively low energy prices cannot compete with new more energy efficient equipment.

The resulting economic disruption associated with higher cost and lower productivity is well known. What is sometimes forgotten is that the stage is set for investments in new technology, and opportunities have been created for marketing new products and new

production processes. Higher energy prices are one of the factors that have contributed to the increase in the intensity of international competition.

Slow population growth in many industrialized countries -- in fact actual declines in population in West Germany and the United Kingdom -- have led to slower growing domestic markets, and the need to develop new markets and protect traditional ones. Innovative non-tariff barriers have achieved the latter and often aggressive government-subsidized marketing is aimed at new markets. In a sense, all of the industrialized countries are looking for export-led recoveries from the economic troubles of the 1970's and these, of course, were all partly attributable to higher energy costs. At the same time, competition from the newly industrialized countries has increased in those standard traditional technology products. Finally, new GAAT Arrangements will increase the access of others to Ontario's traditional markets, both here at home and abroad. International competition and higher energy prices have already changed the economic landscape of Canada and they can be expected to continue to do so. The challenge is to develop the capacity to be flexible and to adapt to the changing cirucmstances that are not always easy to forecast.

A changing circumstance that may be easy to

forecast is the impact of demographic change, but the imposing inevitability of demographic change does not make it easier to cope with. Canada's demographic history has created circumstances in which we are all being forced to adapt at a time when our capacity to adapt is being reduced.

The pressure to change is well known to you as educators. The last graduates of the baby boom, which in the context of education has been somewhat inelegantly compared to a pig in a python's belly, should emerge from the colleges in the mid-eighties, and from the universities a little later. In the meantime, the elementary and secondary education system has had to cope with shrinking pains. The baby boom, and the subsequent baby bust have had, and will continue to have, effects that go far beyond the educational system. The labour market, the housing market, the market for consumer goods and services, as well as the market for government provided services, are all subject to the disruptive effects of meeting the requirements of a large population cohort -- and then adjusting to meet the requirements of a much smaller one.

The message from demographics, which itself is rapidly and perhaps belatedly becoming a growth industry, is that adjustments are imperative. It's also clear that adjusting need not be a wrenching

experience. It can be rewarding. The brewing indstry, for example, has moved to light beer aimed at retaining that traditional product loyalty of an aging baby boom generation that is increasingly concerned with the shape of its own belly. Demographic developments however are also making it more difficult to adapt. Slower labour force growth in the 1980's will mean that economic change will place more of the burden to accomodate those changes on the existing labour force. In the past, economic change has been accomodated by internal migration from rural to urban Ontario, by immigration from abroad, and by increased female participation in the labour force. New industries have traditionally grown with new people. In the future, growing industries will need to rely much more on people leaving declining ones. This suggests an important continuing role for education. Especially the kind the community colleges are capable of offering, even in the face of a decline in the size of the traditional market for educational services.

Peter Drucker has observed that the demand for education is actually going up, not down. What is going down, and fairly fast, is the demand for traditional education in traditional schools. The main point is that education and training will be offered in the 1980's in a market which is shifting from the

sellers' market to that of the buyers. In the baby boom era, meeting the challenge of providing an extraordinarily large group of students with a high quality education required the development of a fairly standardized educational product which could be offered to a fairly homogeneous group on a large scale. In the 1980's the buyers of educational service will change. In an environment in which the labour force is growing at a slower rate, the following examples are typical of the kinds of changes we might expect to occur.

Businesses will rely on upgrading and retraining their own personnel to meet their changing skill requirements. As a result, businesses are likely to expand their involvement in short term intensive training and educational programs. Those leaving declining industries will often need skill upgrading, or totally new skills to move to opportunities in the growing industries. Government priorities will increasingly focus on that need. The common thread will be that, more often than not, these people will be adults in mid-career who have already been through the educational system at least once.

For most of the industrialized world, salvation from higher energy prices, increased international competition and demographic disruption will come from high technology. An international race is on to

apply new technology, such as micro-electronics and bio-technology, to new and existing industries, and to develop new products and improve old ones. This race has assumed such significance because these new technologies seem to be tailor-made for addressing the principal economic problems of today -- improving productivity, saving energy and generating new products for new markets. To compete in this high-tech race, industrialized countries are giving a high priority to Research and Development. Steps are being taken to increase the level of R & D activity and efforts are being made to improve its effectiveness. Ontario, through BILD, is active on both of these fronts.

The BILD Ministers have made a major allocation to the Ontario Development Corporation to take equity positions in high-tech companies. By sharing the risk in these early stages, the climate for innovation and entrepreneurship will be enhanced and the level of R & D increased. The IDEA Corporation, which is now proceeding through the Legislature, will contribute to an increase in the R & D effort and will play a key co-ordinating role in improving the effectiveness of R & D in Ontario. IDEA will co-ordinate and fund research activity in strategic sectors, and will have the power to enter into joint research ventures with industry. It will play an important role in establishing greater links between the universities,

businesses and government research centres.

Ontario will invest in a number of technology facilities -- in automotive parts, micro-electronics, robotics and toxicology -- which will provide an important link between our research institutions and industry. The facilities of the Ontario Research Foundation will be expanded. Finally, BILD has committed major investments to research and manufacturing facilities in such important areas of new technology as rapid transit and bio-technology.

Another important aspect of the race for high technology development in the BILD strategy is the recognition of the role of human resources in economic development. This role is broader than generally thought. First, the existence of a skilled labour force tends to attract the kind of investment that employs those skills. As a recent OECD report notes, in a comment on the West German training system, a virtuous circle has been established in which the presence of skilled people acts as an engine for growth. Manufacturing high-tech products will require a different skill mix than traditional manufacturing. The emphasis is likely to gradually shift away from traditional craft skills to a greater reliance on technicians and technologists. The research and development effort in high technology requires trained

engineers, computer specialists, scientists and technical staff. The success of new high technology firms will depend as much on management and marketing skills as on the research and development side.

Training and education in Ontario will be faced with a significantly different environment in the 1980's compared to the sixties or seventies. Rising energy prices, increased international competition, and demographic developments, have conspired to make it imperative that we increase flexibility and adaptability. Workers will move within regions, industries and jobs with increasing frequency. They, and their employers, will demand, and to an increasing extent will be able to enforce demands, that the education and training system respond to their specific needs.

At the same time the Government's push toward high technology is one that is intimately tied to the training and educational system. Already BILD has allocated $10,000,000 for university research equipment and contracts. In 1981-82, $8,000,000 is allocated for research equipment in engineering and science, and $2,000,000 to provide additonal funding to researchers receiving new or expanded research contracts from industry and government. BILD has provided $8,000,000 to assist the community colleges in acquiring new high technology equipment to provide training in such areas

as microelectronics, computer assisted design and manufacturing, applications of robots, higher technology, and the petro-chemical and energy production industries.

The 81-82 budget is fully allocated, with projects selected from requests totalling $47,000,000. Preference was given to programs with high labour demands for graduates and evidence of a high level of co-operation between the college and local industry. A few examples of projects receiving these BILD funds include a computer aided drafting system at Sir Sandford Fleming, an instrumentation and process control centre at Sheridan, computer assisted manufacturing equipment at Conestoga, and a micro-computer laboratory at Algonquin.

This is just the beginning. Your task over the next two days will be to explore ways in which we might achieve our mutual goals together. Today's critical issues can be the basis of tommorrow's triumphs, if we choose.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES IN THE HIGH TECHNOLOGY ERA

Chairman: Dr. William Newnham
President
Seneca College

Panelists: A.S. Aidelbaum
Past Chairman of the Board
Northern College

Donald Pollock
Former Chairman
Ontario Manpower Commission

Archie Turner
Vice-Chairman
Ontario Council of Regents

DR. WILLIAM NEWNHAM, PRESIDENT, SENECA COLLEGE

The topic assigned to me touches peripherally on college programming and it's relationship with universities, Ryerson and the polytechnic concept. The legislation, as it pertains to post-secondary education, was designed for the most part to address the problems of the post-war period with its baby boom, Sputnik, and with the influx of immigration. A different set of concerns exists now, perhaps created in part by our responses to these post-war problems.

It is interesting to note that after World War II some countries returned to their pre-war economies. Japan and West Germany didn't; perhaps because of circumstances or perhaps by design, they built anew out of the ashes of the old.

There may be messages for us in this, because it seems that the mood is one of crossing a divide for the college system. Perhaps we would do well right now to think about the extraordinary successes that we have enjoyed, to think about the reasons for this success, and to be prepared to effect changes. We have certainly been "with it", but that's yesterday. Let's look ahead. Let's ask ourselves, what factors must we remember and be prepared to face if the next fifteen

years are not to see us standing on the platform smiling and smug while the bus pulls off.

First, let's remember that we have identified very strongly with the community -- advisory committees, Boards of Governors, Council of Regents, and many faculty fresh from business and industry. The programs benefited; they were relevant and they were meaningful.

Second, let's remember that you can only effectively worship one God. I contend that we have succeeded because we stood alone as a college system. We advertised ourselves as a viable alternative to university, and in the early years this was not an easy concept to sell. Let's be cooperative, but let's reaffirm our basic stand.

Third, let's face the fact that just as our revenues are not increasing as rapidly as our expenses, this holds true for other jurisdictions as well. In our college, we are having a great deal of difficulty finding money for essential equipment purchases. We're having difficulty hiring certain kinds of expertise. I know these difficulties occur in other colleges.

I suggest that the lines between the secondary schools and the colleges at the one end, and perhaps between the universities and the colleges at the other, are going to become smudged. The secondary schools will be sending students to us, perhaps for computer

work to take advantage of the equipment that's available, but more importantly because of the scarce people resources which are available. The SERP Report, headed by Duncan Green, suggests this.

Fourth our Deputy Minister chaired the committee which produced the report on the role of universities. It's a report we should all study. The report suggested if certain circumstances prevail, the rationalization of some universities may occur with some of them becoming specialized, because it is not possible for all institutions to be specialists in all areas. I think this has to happen increasingly in the colleges. Pockets of recognized expertise should be reinforced locally, as well as by the Ministry. Programs should be reviewed, and quality should be emphasized and underlined. In short, after such specialization, colleges would have a common vein through them, but their differences would become their strengths.

Fifth, I'm sure we all read the Ryerson Report with a great deal of interest. It began with a quote from a former Federal cabinet minister that suggested that post-secondary institutions in Ontario have not allowed their curricula to be influenced by the needs of business and industry.

The question in my mind was, is this believed at Ryerson? If so, we must liaise with them and we must

tell them what's happening.

Is this believed beyond Ryerson? If so, we have a problem. We have a basic problem of not telling our story firmly enough with one voice rather than ineffectualy piping up singularly as we seem to be doing. The first comment I would make is the curriculum mix of professional subjects, plus the humanities, does exist in the colleges, and not only at Ryerson. It exists in a vocationally relevant way. And second, polytechnic education doesn't exist only at Ryerson. It exists in the colleges, and in some universities.

Has the time come for three or four colleges, plus the Ministry, to free up one able person each, to visit and report to this very group perhaps later this year, on polytechnic education in Japan, West Germany and the U.S.? Polytechnics in England have been studied at some length already.

Can you give me one reason why polytechnic education should not be extended in the colleges? It seems to me that the basics are there. We have shown that we are responsive to community needs. We certainly have pockets of expertise. We have a base of equipment. We have advisory committees and so forth.

Sixth, if you have visited the Third World you know how desperately they need whatever assistance we

can give them. The annual income in certain of their countries is $200.00 a year versus approximately $10,000 in Japan and in the U.S. I think we would be remiss in a shrinking world, if we didn't provide what expertise we can to the Third World countries. I think this has to be done on a fee for service basis. I think we should go beyond this. I think we should fill up the empty spaces that occur in the corners of classrooms of existing programs for which there is a demonstrated need. We should fill up these spaces with visa students, and our government should negotiate with the sending government for a full cost recovery. I admit my experience in international economics is limited, but I have a conviction that this could be one way in which the oil dollars could be returned to our provincial coffers. I think this should apply, not only to the colleges but to all Ontario post-secondary institutions.

My final point is a sensitive one and it arises out of concern. It pertains to work-load. In the next year we are going to hear a great deal about faculty work-load. The initiative is not going to come from us I'm afraid, but it is going to be raised. There are going to be pressures to reduce the existing load. Unfortunate comparisons are going to be made between one post-secondary panel and another. I would like to suggest that consideration be given to establishing

a government commission to look into this area, and to table on the floor of the Legislature reasonable norms for all post-secondary institutions.

The colleges are essentially teaching institutions, and may they remain so. The universities are in teaching and research, and their tremendously necessary mandate extends beyond that.

Would it not be advantageous to have the government table what it considers to be reasonable levels of involvement? This would not result in forcing all instituions to follow, but at least it would be indicating guidelines which could be expected.

Ladies and gentlemen, the panel has completed its presentation. We hope some stimulation has resulted.

A.S. AIDELBAUM, PAST CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF NORTHERN COLLEGE

The issue that I wish to address today has to do with the question of admission standards as they relate to changing population trends and program requirements.

As the movers and shakers of the college system, this group here today can anticipate the new pressures to our existing admission policies. We can look forward to an era when colleges will have to demonstrate more credibility in course planning and admission standards, more credibility in selection procedures, and greater proof of the graduates's ability to perform in the employment environment.

If I may, today, I would like to review some areas of admissions policy and, hopefully, leave you with some new thoughts.

The Report on Admission Policies, Standards and Selection Procedures, produced in May of 1978 by Frances Lacey and committee, is an excellent document that covers this topic in great detail. If admission policy is a particular concern to your college, I would suggest you become familiar with this document.

There is one quotation that I would like to take from the Lacey Report, and it is this:

> "The Committee of Presidents and Senior Academic Officers consider government economic and social policies in their planning, and must often find that stated far-reaching goals of the colleges are actually inconsistent with financing provided to support them. In applying college philosophy to the classroom, faculty must strive to use limited student places effectively, to keep attrition rates as low as possible, and to produce quality graduates who can successfully compete for shrinking job opportunities in some areas. They must also consider the requirements of, and pressures from, external accrediting and licensing bodies. Job security may become a factor as financial and employment market conditions can result in cancellation of programs. Thus the pressure builds up to recruit and admit students who have already demonstrated that they can function effectively in a classroom and thus, are more likely to succeed in the college world".

That's the end of the quotation and I really believe that this statement comes close to saying it all. I would like, however, to move on to some specifics.

The implementation of admission standards is probably one area in which our colleges best perform. The policy that regulates admissions is relatively simple to put into action and flexible enough to allow students into the system. I do not, however, feel that we can become complacent in this area of success. The admission process in many ways, is subject to the basic rule of supply and demand. If we have an adequate supply of seats in relation to student demand,

then we can operate in an open model with forgiving admission standards which in turn could lead to a high attrition rate. If we have restricted enrollment courses, such as nursing and dental assistants, with a short supply of seats in relation to student demand, then we are forced to operate in a closed model, where various selection procedures are, of necessity, activated.

Who are we serving?

Are we dedicated to the needs of the student as an individual?

Are we serving industry, business and the professions by providing trained employees? Or are we creating a home for our rapidly aging instructors and, of course, our ageless presidents?

Knowing full well that the academics here today will accuse me of over-simplifying my approach, I would like to say that our first purpose should be to serve the students. I don't feel that the college story can best be told by high school guidance personnel. I'd like to see an aggressive plan in place where colleges operate and offer more innovative campus pre-enrollment and career counselling. We should consider talking to high school students while they're in grade ten. We need an unconventional, new approach to Guidance. High school guidance officers, who are university graduates,

cannot relate without reservation to the advantages of the college system. Nor are they always currently informed about the employment market.

I feel that students, because of disappointments in not gaining enrollment in first choice courses, accept significantly lower career goals.

Public scrutiny could leave us open for criticism of our Open Door policy and the resulting high attrition rate.

Are we really being fair to the students by having them spend one, two, three or four semesters in the college system, and then blowing them out the back door, discouraged with failure?

Ask yourself the question: are you satisfied with your college's attrition rate? It is time to get serious about education. With no provincial standards for Ontario secondary school graduates, a 70% mark from <u>your</u> high school does not necessarily mean as much as a 70% mark from <u>our</u> high school in Kirkland Lake. This is an easy one for you to answer, but a tough one for admission personnel to sort out.

What do you base your admission decisions on: a border line application to a high-tech course, or a course that will need external accreditation? Our obligation is to help students choose a course in which they have a reasonable opportunity for graduation

success. We are certainly looking at the crossroad between admission policies and guidance services.

The Ministry recommends that standardized tests as a selection procedure are to be discouraged. Perhaps we have an obligation to our prospective students to have them write a qualifying entrance examination. It might be more fair to do that than to have the students flounder.

A thought you could consider is that high-tech courses appear to require some testing, but what is our obligation to our other courses?

Higher secondary school grades in certain required subjects is an established method of selection in more complex courses. College calendars do not always show this, nor are calendars current with admission information because of publishing delays. Changes in course content cannot be updated if it takes two or more years to compile the calendars.

If grade thirteen is eliminated, our entire system may become obsolete. Grade twelve will become eligible for university, and consequently the competition will heighten between colleges and universities. Accepting the fact of brilliant, and not so brilliant in our society, perhaps we should be operating two year courses in our colleges after grade twelve graduation. The courses could be flow through courses, such as with

the American colleges and universities. This was not the original concept of the Ontario community colleges, but if we are looking to the future, it is a thought.

Continuing to service students, we should be lookng at existing courses that are training for jobs that are obsolete, redundant or have a limited job potential. We should have an on-going system of review for existing courses, and have the obligation and the ability to respond.

Are we interested in the student's future welfare, or are we avoiding rocking the boat?

In order to avoid reassigning or dismissing instructors, or closing down courses, we could be looking in the wrong direction. Obviously we have an obligation to both the students and our staff, but by the same token we should look at the crew of planners who dramatically tell us of over-supply in some job areas and then somehow three years down the line we have the colleges jumping to meet the dramatic short supply.

As we say in show business, let's get the act together fellas!

The closed model of admission process brings the selection process of interviews, pre-testing and special requirements under intense scrutiny. Possibly we have been operating more in the open model process,

to avoid the heat.

Is our purpose serious education, helped with a commitment to upgrading, or are we a holding tank between secondary schools and the unemployment statistics?

Given that seat supply does not meet the student demand in restricted programs, and after all selection procedures are exhausted, we have the random choice selection process.

Would you consider a twelve month waiting list for the losers of the random draw?

Should no opening occur in the opening semester, we could consider a preferred seat the following year. It could be an excellent vehicle to maintain good student material and avoid forcing the students to lower their career goals. If a student is willing to wait for twelve months, should we be willing to make some promise to him?

A further area that we could explore might be the idea of a Central Application Centre. The benefits would be to:

1) avoid high school guidance officers making under the table first choice applications,
2) arrive at realistic applicant numbers,

3) inform students of courses with seats available if their first choice is full,

4) ensure that colleges respond to second and third choice applicants,

5) allow smaller colleges, (such as Northern College) access to mailing addresses so that they may contact waiting list students in over supplied high demand courses.

On the subject of elitism, I do not feel that our colleges practise elitism in chosing grade thirteen secondary graduates over grade twelve. Granted, there are bound to be isolated cases that could be questioned. We may, however, be practising elitism in the direction of planning new courses and ignoring industry's need for blue collar workers.

Should blue collar workers be trained and recruited from the academic rejects?

It may be the colleges' future challenge to give prestige to the role of the labourer and instill a value to increase productivity. Fifty per cent of secondary students do not go on to post-secondary education. You can be certain that a large proportion of these students are usually in the bottom half of their class. We should not be planning course content with subjects such as English or Math that were high school stumbling blocks. These course subjects are not

relevant to the blue collar expertise of skilled labour.

The admittance process in the College is committed to act in a manner responsive to the course objectives that your Board, Council of Regents, and Ministry sets out. I don't think it is correct that we put fifty percent of our high school students out in the work force without a post-secondary education.

Many who are nineteen or older and out of work require our rescue process as mature students. We must keep in mind that in admitting a mature student, we still have a commitment that the student has qualifications, and the possibility of being successful and graduating.

We also have the happily adjusted worker who will want admission to a continuous life time learning experience, an entirely new area for us to develop standards in for the future.

I hope I have kindled some more new ideas in your mind. The next sixteen years of college operation might not be as kind to us as in the past. We are in danger of stagnating and could be wasting a lot of time in the policy making process. There is no sense in making policy if it's not implemented effectively.

DONALD POLLOCK, FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE ONTARIO MANPOWER COMMISSION

Today I want to give you what I see as three trends, and then I want to give you four potential impacts that appear to me from these trends.

The three trends I want to cover briefly with you, and to look at from the dimension of college relations with secondary schools, and the business and industrial sector, are the following.

Abe has mentioned the question of higher technology. I believe the impact of the higher technologies will be profound. There'll be a sharp reduction in the demand for low level skills, and growth in demand for high level skills. We're going to need, obviously, fewer stenographic and clerical students, and clearly more students at the computer and technologist level of the scale. It probably will translate into demand for more certificate and diploma programs, and fewer AOTA students.

This will obviously have an impact on your funding levels and your source of funding. Changing Federal government priorities -- and I think the background material is excellent in the way it deals with the reports that have come out within the last three or months -- give an excellent indication of the thrust of the thinking of the Federal government.

Clearly they're committed to high level skills rather than low level skills. And clearly they've lost all interest in adult academic upgrading, because they no longer believe that it plays any part in improving the functioning of the labour market system in Canada.

You're going to have first an impact in Ontario, because Ontario's needs may, or may not, match those of the national labour market. And clearly within the range of product offering that the Federal government is prepared either to finance or to purchase, we're going to see a very major shift.

Secondly, government budgetary constraints will continue to impact on the colleges. My observation is that restraint is here to stay -- that it will never go away. We're not going through some temporary Proposition Thirteen phenomenon. I think that, in terms of education there will be overall government restraint. I think that as tax-payers, we think it's long overdue. But the point is: restraint will exist almost in perpetuity as far as education is concerned.

Decision makers have become infatuated with demographics, particulary as they pertain to education, They see a lower demand for education because they think there will be fewer kids around. They've seen it at the public school level, it's into the high school level, it's now coming into the post-secondary level.

It appears that many decision makers believe they can attach a lower priority to education -- and I think that's exactly what they're going to do over the next ten years. Certainly what it's going to mean is that if you can't get any new money, you're going to have to be much more skillful in the spending of the money you've already got or we're going to face the worst of all conditions -- namely that we won't be able to mount any new programs because we're saddled with a lot of programs that we have now. And I don't use the term program to say for example, civil technology. I'm talking about the programs in the broadest sense. You won't get to do anything different unless you can do something about the areas that you are now offering.

From my observation, what do these trends foretoken for the colleges' relations with secondary schools, business and the industrial sector?

Firstly, there's a major need for a rationalization in the Ontario education system, and I am confident that in the foreseeable future we will see such a rationalization. There are observers at the present time who are reflecting on the lack of provision that was made for integration, when the college system was introduced sixteen years ago. There are those who believe it was plunked down without too much

consideration, primarily for the secondary school/ college interface. I think many people realize the college/university interface is very clearly defined, because of the desire to ensure that the colleges not become transfer institutions for universities. There's nothing sacred about it. It may have made sense sixteen years ago, but it doesn't suggest that there isn't room there for re-examination at the present time.

There are those who suggest that the colleges have seriously undermined vocational training in the secondary schools. I believe there will be increasing pressure to rationalize secondary school and college offerings, and I suggest that the main thrust of it will be twofold.

One, to provide the training as close to home as we possibly can, and to provide it in the lowest cost facilities. This will not only apply, in my view, to skills training, but will clearly apply as well to adult academic upgrading which I believe will become more and more a Provincial responsibility as the Federal government moves away from its traditional position in this area. But given that there are 600 secondary schools in the province, many of them with vocational training facilities, and a growing number of them under utilized, contrasted, on the other side,

by the fact that we have ninety four college campuses; the implications for the colleges could be very significant.

I believe the Linkage type approach will grow, provided, and I emphasize this, provided suitable quality assurance techniques are implemented. I for one, am not satisfied that this is being done at the present time, and it may well be that instead of providing reasonable training in a post-secondary institution, we're really providing training that's not much better than the training that's going on generally at the secondary school level. However, I believe that the Ministry will eventually get it's act together and get us some quality assurance techniques in this area.

I think there will be a major reduction in in-school training at the colleges. I don't think there is any doubt about that. I'm thinking really of the apprenticeship programs because I think the move towards linkage in apprenticeship is a very good idea, and myself and many others can see it occurring outside the present apprenticeship level.

Though it doesn't pertain to secondary education I'd leave you with one further thought. That is this, that privatization of post-secondary vocational education will become increasingly attractive to

decision makers. I suggest to you that it will become very attractive to the Federal government because they are of the opinion that they can buy a similar product cheaper from private schools than they can buy it from you. I wouldn't be surprised to see, within the foreseeable future, the Federal government leading the charge toward doing more business with private vocational schools. It may well be that the province ought to be doing -- or a least examining the possibility of doing -- more business with private vocational schools.

Second trend. Institutional training is under attack and in-industry training is very much in vogue. Again, this is quite well stated in the background material. There is a strong anti-institutional thread in the two major reports that have come out of the Federal government -- the in-house document, Labour Market Development in the 1980's, and the Report of the House of Commons Committee on Employment Opportunities in the 1980's. Institutional training is very much under attack at the present time, and as is always the case, the opposite end of the spectrum always, by difference, looks much more attractive. Everyone is very much infatuated, with in-industry training, even though many people who've observed it consider that the worst training in Ontario today is going on in plants

across the province at the present time. Many people and I am one of them, think it would be scandalous if this were allowed to be expanded.

Nevertheless, the people who are putting up the money for this kind of training think it is a great idea. You've got the Federal government quite prepared to finance an Areospace Training Institute in Winnipeg -- to operate, to an extent, in competition with college programs that already exist in part of Canada. Then you have the Ontario government, through BILD, very happy to pay fifty per cent of the capital cost and operational costs of Employer Sponsored Sector Training Centres.

So the province appears to be prepared to put money into your competition and it's certainly something you should keep in mind.

The third trend is that a higher technology economy will require a better college product. Success in the international high technology field will require a world class product from the colleges.

I'm fascinated by the discussion (and I hope to hear more of it later) about where polytechnics fit in Ontario. I haven't figured out the difference yet between what we have as colleges and polytechnics --

except that one gives a degree and the other doesn't, even though the program is much the same. However, there's no doubt that a growing number of people in Ontario are questioning the quality of the product that is being produced, particularly at the high technology end of the scale, and I think many people are questioning whether we are cost effective in turning out these high technology people. I think more people have to start to look at the completion to start ratio in some of these high level college programs to ensure that the students are being well treated and that the taxpayer is receiving a decent return on his money. And in fact, if we must have advanced standing in mathematics in order to succeed in some of these programs, well, somebody's going to have to grab the bull by the horns and say, look, grade twelve general level math is not good enough for a technology program in the colleges in Ontario. From now on if you haven't got advanced standing in math, grade twelve or grade thirteen, we're not going to take you into this program. If we did you would only fail, and you would be wasting our time and the tax-payers' money.

There is certainly a case that can be made, and I think that the Federal report on Labour Market Developments in the 1980's draws considerable attention

this. There's certainly scope for tailoring these high level programs more closely to the needs of industry today. This suggests some strengthening of the advisory committee approach. It also suggests to me that there is a need for consideration of perhaps a system-wide input mechanism in areas such as this.

The fourth trend and, I draw very heavily upon my experience in the Manpower Commission, is the following: a continuum in industrial training is needed, and this suggests increasing involvement in, and co-ordination if not control, of college offerings by the Ministry. The industrial training system in Ontario is fragmented among many programs offered by a variety of sponsors at a variety of locations. It is evident that employers would be better served by a more integrated system which offered a continuum of high quality programs ranging from CMTP or CMITP at the bottom, through apprenticeship, including Linkage, to certificate and diploma courses at the college level.

The system should be based, in my view, on the modular principle, and should have a higher degree of Ministry involvement than has been typical of industrial training in the past in the Province.

ARCHIE TURNER, VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE ONTARIO COUNCIL OF REGENTS

I'd like to start by saying a personal word of thanks to ACAATO, to the Committee of Presidents, to Fred Hamblin and the others for the documents that they sent out which have been a great source of help to all of us. They've been excellent, and I just want to pass along that word to them.

As cleanup man on this team, I'm going to deviate somewhat from the assigned topic, which is Program Objectives in the High Technology Era, to talk in terms of general issues facing the colleges in the eighties.

It seems to me that it's necessary and desirable at this Opening Session to talk about these issues to set the stage for further discussion of high technology in our colleges.

It's important that we take a look at the changes that will impact on the colleges, their programs and their management over the years. We're not going to discard all the programs that we now have in our colleges and replace them with high technology programs, but we're going to have to take a look at those programs.

I'm sure that you will hear many times during this conference that the colleges are now in the environment

of the eighties -- an environment that will bring higher operating costs for the colleges and proportionately less revenue from the Provincial and Federal governments; a new emphasis on programs leading directly to employment in business and industry; increased government thrusts in support of continuing economic growth; declining enrollment from the secondary schools, and more mature students in the colleges.

In the early sixties, the colleges grew very rapidly in numbers of students, and in varieties of programs. The mandate given to the colleges and the funding available enabled the colleges to respond to the desires, needs, and even demands, of all sectors of the population. Without too much thought being given to the long range needs of the community and the province, programs were launched that attracted students, and in nearly every case guaranteed a reasonable level of employment upon graduation.

These were great years for the college system. College education was firmly established in this province because the colleges responded to a need that had been apparent for a long time.

And now, ladies and gentlemen, the eighties are here and this first phase of college evolution is over. The next phase, and we're looking at it, will

place new demands on the colleges. Certainly, we see the demand for financial restraint, the demand for more selective programming, and the demand for a greater emphasis on the needs of the Ontario business and industrial communities.

What does this mean for the colleges?

Some of you may disagree with this, but I would like to say that with limited funding for post-secondary education in the years ahead, the colleges can no longer be all things to all people. The colleges will change during the eighties, because there will be less money available, which, in turn, will affect their role in serving the needs of the students and the needs of the community.

Unless there is a co-ordinated effort to assess the impact of financial stringency on the colleges, by establishing new priorities and objectives, the quality of education in the colleges may suffer. Limiting financial resources without determining how program rationalization should be carried out, what programs should be offered, where and what degree of specialization should be encouraged, will lead to less than desirable results.

It's encouraging to learn that some progress has been made to rationalize programs on a community basis. I would suggest however, that perhaps we take

a look at that word community and come up with a definition for it. Perhaps it is not just a college area, or the area served by an individual college. Perhaps it is a region of the province and we should take a look at regional rationalization.

Is it not realistic to consider Metro Toronto as a region, Western Ontario as a region, Eastern Ontario as a region, and to rationalize programs accordingly?

Some rationalization will take place on a provincial basis with the result that certain programs will be centralized outside the Golden Horseshoe. As the college system moves along into the eighties the colleges will continue to face unprecedented challenges -- such as the challenge to look at the new economic environment and determine the direction in which the colleges should move, and the challenge to use the available financial resources to plot that direction with quality programs.

The economic environment points to new developments in the business area spear-headed by the impact of technology, by the need for strengthening the province's industrial base, with special emphasis on people trained in the new technology areas.

Programs cancelled because of budget restrictions as well as any new programs developed in the college system have to be based on specified needs and

priorities and these priorities will undoubtedly reflect the increasing importance of the technology which we heard about during our luncheon today.

It would be regrettable, Ladies and gentlemen, if the colleges acted independently to cancel programs or even to launch new programs. System-wide co-ordination is essential if we are to avoid chaotic results. Only on a system-wide basis can such issues as program rationalization, specialization, high technology and skilled training be handled effectively. Co-ordination of thought and effort will be required to determine which programs in the system should be restructured, and which programs should be cancelled. For example, it is conceivable that such programs as English as a Second Language and remedial upgrading may have to be transferred to other institutions as scarce funds are required for higher priority programs. And perhaps the time has come when we should say that there's neither money, nor space for programs that do not fall into the category of post-secondary education.

I am convinced that the colleges will meet the challenges of the eighties. I have no doubt that they will meet them as effectively as they met the challenge back when the colleges first came into being. But only, if first, we develop a co-ordinated system-wide approach to plotting goals, objectives and priorities.

No one college or agency can do it alone. It has to be a joint effort of the Ministry, the Council of Regents, the Committee of Governors, and the Committee of Presidents. The need is urgent and the time is short.

Secondly, the colleges will meet the challenge if there is the same co-operative approach to determining what programs should be offered and at what colleges.

Thirdly, the colleges will meet the challenge if we are prepared to eliminate duplication of programs, equipment and staff across the system by concentrating programs and enrollment. And if we acknowledge the need to move rapidly into specialization in the areas that can utilize business and technology in co-operation with the government, with business and with the industrial community.

Fourth, the colleges will meet the challenge if they are prepared to surrender some of the autonomy they have enjoyed in the interest of a co-ordinated college system.

Fifth, the colleges will meet the challenge if we accept the fact that the limited funds available to the college system will suffice only if we operate as a system.

Finally, we have to recognize that the colleges will experience a rather significant change in clientele. This change in clientele will come about

through the redistribution of programs and in part, because of the declining enrollment in secondary schools.

As the colleges become more specialized and the programs more centralized, there may be a strong demand for students to submit their application forms through a central agency. I want to leave this thought with you. The need to send applications to several colleges would be unnecessary if we carried out the things that I have outlined, because access to programs would be limited to the colleges offering such programs.

PROGRAM DELIVERY IN A CHANGING ENVIRONMENT

Chairman: Jacqueline Robarts
President
Niagara College

Panelists: George Farrow
Chairman of the Board
Sheridan College

Dr. Riske Taher
Director, Training Programs
Canada Employment & Immigration

Dr. Diana Schatz
Member
Ontario Council of Regents

GEORGE FARROW, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS
SHERIDAN COLLEGE

As Chairman of the Sheridan College Board of Governors, I am vitally concerned with the role of the community college, and the quality of education as it relates to teaching and learning. I'm here today to report on a project initiated by Sheridan administration in an attempt to preserve that role and quality.

While we are all concerned with making ends meet and in keeping programs current and relevant, we must also ensure that our students are receiving a quality education and gaining meaningful employment after graduation.

We've been doing our utmost to fulfill this mandate for years.

We enjoyed a generous flow of funds and students during the golden sixties, then came the restraints in the seventies which prepared us for the challenging eighties. Or did they prepare us? Of course, we have done our multi-year planning, our statistics and forecasting. The need for future planning and priority setting has always existed, but the difference today is that institutions have to

begin to address seriously the question of priorities.

I intend to tell you how Sheridan plans to handle the critical issues of priority setting, while fulfilling its objective to offer quality programs within the budget allotments.

Sheridan has developed an innovative evaluation criteria system and with the support of the Deans and input from faculty, hopes to have a workable plan which will determine those programs we keep and develop, and those which should be phased out.

I would like to take you through the development process and explain how the criteria were established, the considerations involved, the implementation process and some of the implications. Lastly I'll explain how faculty and staff responded when asked for their input.

First of all, to fully understand Sheridan's situation, I'll provide some background information on the college. We have a full-time post-secondary enrollment of 5,639 which represents a 2.7% increase over last year, and that was down somewhat from our original projection. In addition, there are 1600 full-time retraining students and about 40,000 students are expected to take part-time courses this year, through community services.

Sheridan has eight campuses in the Halton and Peel

Regions. This is a growing industrial area, which is densely populated, and according to recent statistics that growth is expected to continue for the foreseeable future. Sheridan offers more than seventy full time post-secondary programs, and this year we are operating at capacity at most of our campus locations. This year as well, we expanded our community services operation, so that evening and credit and interest courses are now offered at ten different locations.

We started off this budget year with a possible deficit of approximately $472,000, but we hope to eliminate this deficit position by seizing all available opportunities to reduce expenses. We could be faced with possible deficit financing position next year and maybe the year after that.

With Federal transfer funding not very promising, and the over-all tight economic situation with declining post-secondary enrollments, Sheridan set out to develop a program evaluation system, which it may find necessary to implement. The Council of Regents has made it quite clear that it wants the colleges to balance their budgets. This year, we were able to trim costs here and there. Institutions normally respond to deficit financing by cutting services and by delaying equipment purchases and building renovations, which

Sheridan did to a certain extent.

Similarly, over the years Sheridan has pinpointed areas through social and political environmental changes that had to be restructured or phased out. We eliminated some programs and started some new ones. Quite a few years back, we closed our Malton campus operation. It was a simple case of supply and demand in the aircraft industry.

We feel that the situation is a little different right now. More drastic measures are needed. This academic year, for the first time, Sheridan reduced the number of program contact hours. It was a college-wide action. Policies such as this could eventually weaken the quality of programs, and therefore affect our objectives. Cutting services, or halting equipment purchases, are methods which provide short term financial gains -- immediate money in the bank, you might say. We've taken this a step further, and plan now to look at total units, which will save money in the long term while improving program quality.

Most administrators approach program reduction as a budget issue, while in reality it should be a planning issue with continuous review. I'll now briefly describe step by step our evaluation method -- one which, I might say, is an aggressive but creative approach to a critical issue.

The college started with an eight member committee comprising the President, Vice-President, two Campus Principals and four Academic Deans. This group defined criteria for the evaluation of all college programs. Those criteria were established in four categories:

1) Demand for the program from an enrollment and an employment point of view,
2) Quality of the program as it relates to faculty, equipment and facilities,
3) Cost,
4) Political implications.

Within each area the committee established sub-categories with a high, average and low measurement scale. Then the committee sought the support of all academic deans. They in turn took the criteria to their faculty who were asked for input on those factors to be considered when ranking the programs in any of the categories, or sub-categories.

Before I discuss faculty reaction, I'll explain in more detail program grouping and the evaluation criteria. In the first area, the basic program evaluation criteria is demand or need for the program. Under this section there is student demand, which is measured on a scale of high, moderate and low for present and projected enrollment. Demand for graduates would be measured in a similar way -- present and

projected enrollment. Demand for graduates would be measured in a similar way -- present and projected -- on a high, moderate and low scale which would indicate career opportunities available to graduates both present and projected.

The second area is quality of the program which measures faculty, equipment and facilities. Faculty would be evaluated on teaching qualifications, experience and updated activities.

The third evaluation criteria is resource requirements of a program. Its sub-sections would be rated on cost per student as it relates to average class size, supplies, equipment, and support staff requirements.

Finally, the fourth category is the political factors which would be rated in the following ways: relation to college mission or value; relation to other programs, curriculum, faculty and equipment; availabilty of alternatives, regionally, provincially; and public relations impact.

These are the criteria. They should be kept simple and uncomplicated. The idea is not to get caught up in a lot of detail -- whether the value of a program is worth seventy or seventy-five isn't important. It's whether it's in the area it is required, that there's a big need for the students, there's a moderate need, or

there is a decreasing need. And that's all that one needs to know to make a decision.

From the results of the evaluation, programs would be divided into four clusters. The clusters are:

(a) programs to be continued at the current level of activity regarding resource allocation, enrollment, and number of faculty.

(b) programs now in existence slated for further developments as areas of excellence.

(c) existing programs to be continued but at a reduced level of activity and resources, and,

(d) programs now in existence that are to be phased out.

This will enable us to identify through (c) and (d) those programs that provide the most immediate and maximum net resources to support the programs in the clusters (a) and (b).

It has been found to be virtually impossible to separate economic and educational factors in considering program discontinuation.

Sheridan will be faced with looking at both the quality of the program being considered for phase out,

and the financial implications of what it would take to bring that program up to the standards met by the other programs in the college.

Before we actually make a decision to discontinue a program, we would first consider some creative alternatives. For instance, in cases where a program has a high cost and is of mediocre quality, but is recognized as having a public service value, the college may not want to eliminate this program. Instead, it would be important to consider an alternative to closure, such as merging it with another area of the college, transferring it to another community college or developing a co-operative program with the university. The program's curriculum could also be changed to reduce the cost without adversely affecting the program's quality.

Several factors would have to be taken into account if Sheridan decided to discontinue any of its programs, such as the role of the faculty and the future of the students. This is the basis of the important need for Sheridan to examine its institutional values. They are what guide the action of the college.

A continuous and effective communication plan, and a constant review of role and mission are recommended by experts who have implemented such an evaluation

program. In this way, if a college discontinued programs for budgetary reasons, or any other reasons, these statements wouldn't come as a shock and would become understood both by the academic community and the external audience.

Time-lines for program closures should be developed prior to the time they are actually needed to allow sufficient lead time for thinking through the process. This can save time and trouble and there would be no charges of arbitrary decision making.

One rather obvious question that arises out of the entire evaluation process is who should make the decision to cancel or phase out a program?

Studies show that the final decision rests with the Board, in connection with the administration which is responsible for conveying the decision to the affected area. One way in which academic democracy differs from other kinds of political democracy is the fact that there is one final authority. The college boards have the authority over academic matters, but such decisions are generally made on the advice of the president and the senior administration.

This provides you an update on how Sheridan is progressing with its project, but I would be remiss in my discussion if I didn't tell you how the faculty are are reacting to this evaluation process. Let's say

it's not universally popular, but on the other hand it is not universally unpopular either. The response has been varied. There have been some very positive responses in about seventy-five percent of the program areas. But then we have another group, and that's basically in the liberal and general arts area who chose to comment their disapproval by going to the press. A newspaper article referred to the process as a self execution.

Any readjustment is painful at first. In fact, for some people any changes bring outbursts of resistance to some degree. As democratic as we were to involve faculty, these systems break down in any country as well as in any college. We have to face reality and we have a realistic client. What we've had to learn through this whole process is to keep the system simple -- take it slow, and recognize that whatever you do, you're going to be in trouble.

One university president responsible for implementing program elimination, using a similar plan, said a barrage of protest should be expected from students, faculty and others.

Deciding to close a program is an act of courage. If the future of higher education is to survive a projected decline in reduced public support, maintenance of academic quality demands such courageous

decisions. The types of decisions facing the educational institutions today will not win popularity contests for boards and administrators.

On a more philosophical note, society is not ready to accept no growth, decline and defeat. As one educator explained, we have been socialized to expect growth. The thinking has always been that any change should be met with addition, not substitution or subtraction. It's this type of thinking that supports existing policy and is one of the main reasons why some institutions just don't take any action on discontinuing programs. When presented, however, with a reasonable amount of factual information and taking all factors into consideration, we hope that everyone will accept the philosophy that selective excellence is needed in a time of shrinking resources.

Given the background of the development of the evaluation criteria process and its application, Sheridan will be prepared to deal with situations that require major program decisions. We agreed that the only way to maintain the quality and viability of the college is to consider discontinuing some programs in order to support our best programs adequately. Whether or not Sheridan decides to use the process because of budget restraints remains to be seen. But if the time

comes, we will be in a position whereby any action taken will have been well thought out. It will not be an arbitrary decision made in haste and under pressure. The processes and procedures have to be in place and consulted before the crisis appears -- so that there is time for reasonable deliberation. Preferably the method should be generally agreed upon by those who are affected.

Sheridan has interpreted the eighties as a decade of survival. Unless there is a windfall and an abundance of money is made available, survival requires the colleges to be cognizant of their environment and aware of changing social patterns and needs of students -- plus most important, we must create our future through strategic planning. And at the same time, we have to be concerned with the financial status and the morale of the college -- a tall order. While no system can be perfectly developed and implemented, I can honestly say that a lot of time and effort has gone into creating this process. We've weighed the qualitative against the quantitative -- an agonizing process, but quality always tips the scale.

With this evaluation technique, Sheridan will be better able to monitor the social, political and economic environment and plan its future accordingly. We hope our careful planning and implementation may serve as a model for other colleges.

DR. RISKE TAHER, DIRECTOR OF TRAINING PROGRAMS CANADA EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION

The enivironment in the eighties is going to be quite different from the environment in the seventies. The changes are going to be upon us and they are going to be very fast in terms of the rate of change.

Planning becomes the protective mechanism to facilitate the changing world -- to be able to respond to the changing world. If we are unaware of the change, then it becomes a shock to administrators and people who are going to be facing these kind of changes. The changes are going to be sudden, but we can plan for them in terms of expectations, in terms of predication.

How are we going to face the 1980's?

We know that the labour market in Ontario, and in Canada, is going to change. The population is aging, the characteristics of the population in terms of mix between male and female is going to drastically change. We also know that the technological changes of industry are quite considerable.

What is going to happen as a result of these technological changes?

Occupational demands are going to be completely different. New occupations are going to emerge. We talk about robotics; we talk about micro-electronics; we talk about bio-engineering; we talk about many of the things

which we become accustomed to reading about in the newspaper, but they haven't hit us yet. It's like our reaction to the oil crisis. How are we going to adjust to the changing energy situation?

Some people say that there is going to be a new industrial revolution. The world of work is going to be different. In facing these realities, we have to be able to forecast,and we have to be able to forecast on the basis of being fifty percent right and fifty percent wrong.

What are we going to do?

Money is not going to be readily available. It's going to be very difficult to maintain what we always believed to be good, because in the training field, training is going to be on the increase. The training demand is not going to diminish. All the changes which are going to be upon us will necessitate a greater need for training, a greater need for re-training, and a greater need for upgrading, if we are to maintain a strong work force that will sustain our economic existence. The demand on the services that we collectively are required to provide will increase, and yet the resources which are available to us are on the decrease.

We have to collectively think about prioritization. We have to collectively think about where we put our energy and our funds and our resources to obtain the

maximum benefit for those resources. Even if we can say that all of our programs are good we can only afford to maintain the best at the unfortunate expense of something which is also worthwhile.

The inter-relationship between industrial training and institutional training is the focal point of this discussion. Let me therefore briefly pass on some of my thoughts to you.

We all know that we have the Parliamentary Task Force with a report already in place, and we know that there is a Departmental Task Force Report in place. Both reports are being discussed, and I'm sure they are being extensively discussed by you too. So while these reports do not represent government policy at this time, they will probably influence government policies in the eighties. My comments, therefore, will be related to existing policies and to my understanding of the recommendations of these two reports, without necessarily implying or making any predictions as to what the new policy is or is likely to be.

In the context of institutional training, I suppose we have been living with a change in Ontario for the last two and one half years in the context of trying to come to grips with the critical skill shortages in Ontario.

How can we adjust in order to address a shortage that became known to us consciously or unconsciously almost on a short term basis?

All of a sudden we found out that we have a potential crisis, a potential shortage. All of a sudden we became aware that the supply is not at the level that will sustain continuity of supply. All of a sudden we found out that we have to find solutions to the crisis at hand. You are experiencing this crisis on a daily basis in terms of addressing these shortages under Employer Sponsored Training.

Employer Sponsored Training, to me, resembles the kind of integrated approach to the provision of training which we have to think about -- the integrated approach in terms of what can be done best in institutions and what should be done best by industry.

As you know, our policy respecting industrial training is based on the conviction that training is the responsibility of industry and the responsibility of the employer to start with. Training of the existing work force, training of the existing employees, is indeed the responsibility of the employer. The cost of that training is part of the employer investment in doing that. Having said that, then we should maintain a policy of assisting employers to accept more readily their responsibility for training. On the other hand, we have the responsibility

of providing skills and knowledge to people who are not in the labour force, but who are interested in entering the labour force. For those people we should provide them with the skills that will facilitate their entry or re-entry into the labour market, to increase their employability, and to increase their learning capacity.

We have really a dual role in training. One is to look at the skills of the individual and to improve them so that they can be productive -- or be more productive -- and to satisfy the needs of industry in terms of work force. These two objectives have to be integrated into one plan.

Traditionally, institutional training has been under what we call CMTP, and has been concerned with the people who are unemployed, the people who are interested in entering the labour market at the basic entry level. Perhaps this needs to be assessed. Should we concentrate on the provision of lower level skills? Should we not provide skills that will allow people to have a greater upward mobility, particularly when we know that the shortages of people are in the medium to high level skills? And if we want to do that, how are we going to do it? Would it be totally an institutional training proposition? Or should we look at these programs in a co-operative mode with industry having an input to the process and having an input to the production of the work

force they need?

Obviously, the answers are not very straightforward, but these are the things which we have to consider. How are we going to integrate industrial training and institutional training? What are the issues at hand? In an environment of constraint, how can we expand the training base to incorporate industry as a training base?

The establishment of a lasting industrial training capability alongside your institutional training capability is perhaps an answer to the provision of the total training system without necessarily having to cut. Probably what the colleges cannot do may be done by industry. Perhaps what industry is now doing can be taken on by the colleges.

Expanding the base of training is, in my opinion one of the answers which can sustain the development of a sound work force.

DR. DIANA SCHATZ - MEMBER, ONTARIO COUNCIL OF REGENTS

Why is it that everyone wants solutions? That's what the ACCC seems to want and a few other people that I've become involved with. Perhaps it's because we're in a decade of problems that need new solutions and we have to look to each other for solutions or answers that we used to depend on ourselves to find. I've been asked to talk on continuing education and I thought for a few minutes I would describe what I think continuing education is. Certainly, the title given to me, "Continuing Education, Recurrent and Lifelong Education" is fast becoming the catch phrase of the eighties.

Many professional societies are looking to continuing education credits as means of demonstrating one's maintenance and renewal of competence. Adults are looking at ConEd to provide them with skills they can no longer afford to purchase in our expensive society -- such as plumbing courses and electrician's courses and there's even a few women, I understand, in the small motor repair programs. Families are looking to CE to develop expertise to be applied in their recreational time. Unemployed workers are taking courses to upgrade their ability in order to find employment, and employed workers are seeing ConEd as a part of job making and job improvement.

In a world that is becoming more complex and is affected significantly by technological change, ConEd is being accepted not only as a way of life but as a pre-

requisite of survival.

When you look at the number of CE providers we have in Ontario today, it's enormous. It involves all the formal educational systems. A large number of employers are in the CE game, providing inhouse ConEd. Volunteer organizations play a significant role in avocational continuing education, and even unorganized groups of adults band together to initiate learning activities.

Essentially, the ConEd system involves enormous numbers of subsystems and the system as a whole is unorganized - that is, it's a non-system. This is one of the unique characteristics of continuing education which I would like to see unchanged into the next decade, particularly because of financial limitations.

There are other unique characteristics of ConEd. First off, and I hope this remains unchanged, it's a voluntary system -- perhaps because a voluntary student is motivated and committed, and is prepared to undertake significant independent learning in support of the courses given by the educational institution. The system is flexible and has no characteristic delivery pattern. Individual courses survive only because they address and meet student needs. Course offerings change rapidly; and those of you who are involved in ConEd know that you may be redesigning fifty to sixty percent of your courses every year. Some continuing education can be run on a

direct cost recovery basis, and in many hands, and I think seen as a profitable business.

In the few available minutes, I would like to address the colleges role only in one area -- and that's vocational continuing education.

Recent studies, and our former speakers, have suggested that twenty-five to sixty percent of the work force will require some form of retraining in order to maintain employment.

I am aware of only one study that has evaluated the impact of continuing education and demonstrated a direct link between it and the ability of a worker to perform on the job efficiently. In the area of health diagnostic services, Ontario was one of the first jurisdictions to develop an external proficiency testing program to evaluate the quality of service being given to patients. Four hundred and fifty diagnostic services in Ontario were involved. The results demonstrated that the large metropolitan institutions had the most consistent quality of performance and that the level of performance decreased with the size of the institution.

In the smaller institutions studied, the numbers of staff were small. Since the staff had to be, in most cases,within calling distance of the hospital in case of emergency, their mobility was significantly reduced. Peer interaction and inservice education were not a reality, and there were no

senior professionals to consult in the case of difficulty. The small institution employee was forced to rely on his existing knowledge and skills, and that knowledge had been gained, in some instances, from two to twenty years previously.

The direct opposite was true in the case of large institutions in the study. The one advantage that the large institutions had (in addition to peer interaction and inservice education) was that they had easy access to, continuing education courses offered by a multitude of organizations, including universities and colleges.

In the final phase of the study, on-site education was provided selectively for the staff of the institution where performance difficulties were identified. Within two years there was a measurable and significant increase in the quality of performance at those institutions. The factor to which the study linked the improvement and quality was relevant on-site continuing education. The experience just described in proficiency testing and on-site ConEd has, I believe, relevance to the discussion of the CAAT role, individually and collectively, in continuing education.

Firstly, it is a demonstration that relevant continuing education can improve the ability of employees to perform with quality.

Secondly, it identifies one of the areas of greatest unmet needs -- that is, relevant vocational continuing education for employees in smaller organizations, in rural and remote communities.

It also points out that many people are not able to attend continuing education courses unless they are available locally.

If the colleges are to address this need, they will be moving programs out from established campuses. They will be providing for small groups of students and they will be coping with higher development costs. All of these doubtless stand out in a decreasing financial resource climate. Whether or not individual colleges can respond on an outreach basis will depend on each college's financial attitude toward continuing education. There are already signs that decisions regarding the offering of CE programs are being made solely on the basis of student needs.

Certainly, the cost of continuing education is not small. It's related to three major areas: program development, faculty cost and direct supply. Program development costs are definitely smaller for those colleges which have related full-time programs and can adapt existing resources rather than creating new ones. Higher program development costs can be borne by the colleges which serve the large CE populations, the

metropolitan and urban areas, but what of the colleges that don't fall into these two groups?

To tie the ideas so far presented together in the context of dependence, independence and interdependence of the colleges as they relate to vocational continuing education, I would like to suggest a scenario between college X, serving a rural area and college Y, serving an urban area. College X identifies a need for CE in an area not covered by existing programming within the college. College Y has the relevant full-time programs, and already has CE program offerings in this area. College Y agrees to make available to college X all or part of the program support materials such as course outlines, student notes, examinations.

Could not this sharing go even further and involve faculty and portable teaching equipment? Why cannot these two items important to CE be exported from one college and loaned to another? If so, College X can then mount College Y's program in whole or in part and it can reimburse College Y for the direct expenses. The result of such a scenario is that College X can conduct programs in areas of identified need accessing the total college system's resources.

Program rationalization in continuing education must, of necessity, be different from program rationalization suggested for the full-time programming. It cannot be on

a regional or provincial basis. Why? The students are not mobile and they cannot be moved in the same way that full-time students can. Rationalization in the ConEd area should therefore probably be based on the program moving rather than students. Once program development costs have been recouped by the initiating college, I would hope the program sharing would be on a direct cost basis so that in the smaller college setting programs become viable with smaller class sizes.

One last comment. If there were an effective vocational continuing education network -- that is, programs spread widely through the province -- the pressure to expand full-time programs to provide learning for a life long career would be reduced. Shorter initial entry programs focusing on the first five years of employment could be defended in the marketplace, provided that a complementary continuing education system was available to give skills training when needed.

Continuing education, in my view, is not a separate third system. If developed and rationalized widely, it will release full-time programs from teaching skills which will not be used in the first years of employment. We can look to shorter more economical programs without sacrificing the general education component. This can be done because we know that the new skills can be taught when they are needed, through the CE network.

Continuing education is one area of enormous potential for growth. I hope that in the rationalization plans and view which are discussed, it will not be rationalized into isolation from the full-time programming but rather together with it. Hopefully, when CE rationalization is completed, the outcome will not be a centralization or regionalization program, but rather a wider distribution, hopefully at lower unit cost.

RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND MAXIMIZATION

Chairman: Doug Light
President
George Brown College

Panelist: Dr. Charles Johnston
Member
Ontario Council of Regents

John Humber
Director, College Affairs Branch
Ministry of Colleges and Universities

MR. DOUG LIGHT, PRESIDENT, GEORGE BROWN COLLEGE

Ladies and Gentlemen, if your ears have been open for the past two panels I'm sure you've come to the realization that the college system has entered a new era. It's facing a new reality, a new state of affairs -- and that new state of affairs is essentially an economic condition. In simple terms it's a harsh fact of life that the revenue base for the college system in the future will be, at best, as it is today, but more probably will be worse.

That harsh reality is reflected in the past three years as we examine statistically our revenue support. If we examine the support in terms of the constant dollar for full-time equivalent students, we'll note some four years ago we received something in the order of $2,240 per FTE student. Today we receive about $1,820, a reduction in real dollars of over $400, or twenty percent. If you take into account that we've grown this year by probably seven percent, and accept the probability that the provincial government will fund us at a level lower than inflation, then we're going to have an erosion again in that basic unit -- such that a speaker next year may well say that we have incurred an erosion of twenty-five percent in our basic

revenue grant.

That's the harsh reality that we face. And when you reflect on the comments of Don Pollock the other day, when he said that there will be a reduction in the financial support of the Federal government to the colleges, our picture is loud and clear for the eighties.

So, indeed, we will have shrinking, dwindling financial resources, but I suppose there will continue to be a pot of money for distribution. I hope that's the case anyway.

How are we going to distribute or allocate that money?

Well, undoubtedly in the post-secondary area we'll continue to use that wonderful distribution mechanism that was introduced a few years ago.

That distribution mechanism, I suggest to you, remains a logical instrument, but only if it's coupled with an appropriate growth policy. It is not at the moment. And I'd like to illustrate to you the effects of that allocation mechanism by citing a few revenue examples.

This year George Brown will receive a five percent increase in revenue. Next year we'll receive five percent. The following year we'll receive fourteen percent -- assuming, of course that John Humber gives

the system ten percent.

Over the next two years nine colleges will receive below ten percent, and thirteen will receive above ten percent. College A this year receives eleven percent, next year College A will receive six percent, the following year College A will receive five percent. College B has an interesting fluctuation -- receiving fourteen percent this year, eight percent next year, ten percent the following year. College C, and I say this with great envy, will receive thirteen, fifteen and fifteen percent.

Is that type of fluctuation acceptable to the college system? I suggest to you that it is acceptable for a short period of time because there will be an adjustment period where we will all be approaching the same levels of efficiency. But if it continues on for a protracted period, I suggest the system will tend toward a chaotic state. And that is a strong possibility, because if you look at the system growth this September you'll note that all but three colleges had significant growth.

I suggest to you, because of our excellent market penetration into grade twelve and thirteen, that over the next two or three years we will indeed see the vast majority of the colleges growing. They will grow at different rates and if this is the case, and if we have

a revenue base which is less than inflation, then you're going to have the fluctuations I just described.

Eventually, at some point in time, some colleges will grow at the expense of other colleges. If we are faced with a dwindling unit revenue base and with wide fluctuations because of our distribution mechanism, how do we address these two factors?

I suggest to you that first of all we take a band-aid approach to give us time for our major address to the new reality of life, the new economic condition which translates into survival. That band-aid approach requires that in the next academic year the college system move from its view of unlimited growth to one of controlled growth. When we talk of controlled growth, we have to realize that wih a system growth of seven percent this year there's a built-in carry over growth of about three percent.

I propose that the freshman intake for the college system will have a modestly controlled growth next year. It should be defined along the lines of those colleges which are at the lower end of the financial receipt basis so that they could have unlimited growth. I could cite those examples, but I will not. There are a number of colleges in need of major catch-up. They should be permitted to have unlimited

growth, and a variation upwards for next year.

I propose a band-aid answer to minimize the attrition, the reduction of the basic unit grant, and to dampen the fluctuations that would occur beyond the two year period I just projected -- but more importantly, to give us a period of time to make a major address to the new state of affairs that we've entered.

That new state of affairs, I suggest to you, we must accept. I have no hope whatsoever that the clamour and the efforts of the university sector will result in significant changes in the financial level. The harsh reality is that the Province of Ontario does not have the revenue base to significantly increase the financing of post-secondary education, and it's very difficult to rob Peter to pay Paul today. I just don't think it can be done. So I think what we must face in the eighties is a realism that we're going to have fewer employees than we have today. We'll probably, for the next three to four years, have at least the same number of students or more, and yet we must provide programs of at least the same quality and preferably better quality.

So what I suggest is that we face the facts of life and we move:

1) To set up a massive review of our curriculum with a specific prescribed goal, and that is a reduction of contact hours on a weekly basis of about twenty percent. Now I levitate that comment by suggesting that we move to extend the length of our post-secondary programs from thirty-two to thirty-six weeks per year. The reason I'm proposing that, of course, is to maximize our utilization to the utmost of the Memorandum Agreement with faculty. By taking that compensating step then I'm really talking about a staff reduction of about ten percent in hours per year in our programs.

2) To rationalize our programs on a regional basis (and I must add very quickly that in the post-secondary area it has yet to be proven to me that there are significant savings in rationalization). Basically, rationalization is based on the assumption that if you have a program that you're not breaking even on, or going beyond that, we integrate with other programs to make viable units.

I'm not hopeful for significant savings in the area of post-secondary programs, but I am hopeful for significant savings in the apprenticeship and manpower programs. All that is lacking there, quite bluntly, is a central decision making body to minimize the proliferation and duplication of our apprenticeship and manpower programs.

We are talking about survival, we're talking about only those components of a college that are absolutely necessary. I do not see that, five years hence, under the current economic conditions, we will have the extent of student services that we provide in the colleges today. The counselling function I think will be returned, as in days of yore, to the faculty. The presence of house service nurses will disappear in the future.

I think we must look for new avenues -- for example in placement, where perhaps on a regional basis we set up one placement office to service a whole college community.

We obviously must address the whole energy issue. On examining my budget, I notice we're spending about two percent of our over-all operating budget -- in excess of a million dollars -- in energy, and that's escalating at about ten to twenty percent per year. I think we must address that on a regional, and on a

provincial basis, and prescribe conditions to be met.

So in summary, I suggest to you that we accept the fact that we have a harsh economic climate. It's a state of affairs. I believe we must address it quickly. We have only a limited time to do so, or I'm afraid disaster could very well result.

I propose that we enter next year in a controlled growth situation as a band-aid approach to give us time to make a major address to the new reality. That major address should be accomplished by a mechanism not, as I wish, by volunteer co-operation, because it wouldn't be done that way. I think there must be some volunteer or co-operative aspect with some direction, and I suggest to you the mechanism that we used in the allocation distribution mechanism is a realistic one. It does permit participation, but on the other hand there is a time crunch -- and we must have, a complete over-haul of the college system.

DR. CHARLES JOHNSTON, MEMBER
ONTARIO COUNCIL OF REGENTS

These have been a couple of interesting days. One of the main things that has struck me is that every time you ask a question, you get a question back. Somebody says what are we going to do about high technology, and the next question is what the hell do you mean by high tech? Or somebody says how are we going to rationalize the programs, and somebody says what the hell do you mean by rationalization? I hope by tomorrow we'll have the answers to all those questions.

When a discussion on the utilization and maximization of human resources comes up, we have to look at the forces which impact on their output -- that is, the productivity of those resources. And in our particular case this is even more true, because so much of our total financial resources go to the maintenance of our college staff. And when you add to this the issues of funding and financial constraints, collective bargaining becomes a crucial issue.

One way to achieve productivity is to increase your output in a quantitative sense -- for example, the hours of work for class size, or, in other words, the

work load. In order to achieve this maximization, management must retain the ability to adjust to changing circumstances quickly. We've all bumped into that, as determined by the needs of not only the country and the province, but your own community and the needs of the students, which are our primary purpose.

Collective bargaining has to provide the framework which permits college management to act effectively and efficiently.

My initiation into the education field and management role was when I was Chairman of a School Board in the old Port Arthur. The problem then was one of each school board playing one off against the other, to their best advantage. And after that introduction to bargaining, I'm still of the opinion that the best framework is a province-wide bargaining system. It's more effective in the long run in keeping costs down, and the union can't play the whipsaw game, one against the other.

One argument against centralized bargaining is that it tends to make more rigid those conditions that affect the ability of management to operate with some freedom; therefore it's not really helpful in the area of increasing productivity. The problems, however, are not insurmountable, but two things must happen.

One, the Colleges, the Council of Regents, and the Ministry must co-operate more effectively in the area of communication.

You know, we all get into a problem when we find out that somebody is doing something that we didn't know about, and why the hell didn't they let us know, and why didn't they ask for our opinion, and that sort of thing.

So there is a lack of communication. We know that at the Council, and you know that at the Board level. Council gets accused, sometimes of being a buffer between the Board and the Minister -- of being a mystical body that gets in the way of college progress. But I can tell you that we're human, and we are wanting to co-operate.

The second thing that should happen is that the legislation, and the collective agreement, must provide a system to resolve the local issues at the college level. We can settle all the things about John's money and everything else, but there are a lot of local things that come up that I think should be settled locally.

I think that this is very important -- because a single solution may be quite appropriate to one college and not at all appropriate to another. A solution for a big college wouldn't mean a thing to a small college.

And I don't think a penalty of any kind should ever be imposed system-wide in order to restrain one or two who don't want to play the game, or play by the rules. I've been hearing some comments over the last couple of days, mainly having to do with not knowing what the other guy is doing, so it just reinforces my opinion that we have to improve the communication between the Boards and the Council, and the Council and the Ministry, and the Ministry and the Boards.

The Collective Bargaining Steering Committee and other similar structures have to be improved if the bargaining process, which includes the administration of the Collective Agreement, is to provide the colleges with the ability to change quickly and productively to meet future needs.

As the author of the paper "Collective Bargaining Model" in your material, states: "After examining the very limited range of practical alternatives, the real challenge to the colleges may well be to take appropriate action through present mechanisms or new ones, to resolve the problems and improve the current systems."

I think that as long as we have people like Doug Light and many of the presidents, we'll survive. I've lived through these fifteen years when we were trying to start the colleges and we've all survived. So maybe

it's my age or something, but I still think we're going to survive into the eighties.

I know that some of you may not be aware that the work of the Steering Committee doesn't stop when a settlement is reached. They're still involved in the administration of the Agreement, and then in analyzing the actual collective bargaining process. So we must also examine the legislation and the bargaining process itself, and take action to create the environment which will allow local operational issues to be resolved locally, thus providing the flexibility required to maximize the utilization of our human resources.

JOHN HUMBER, DIRECTOR, COLLEGE AFFAIRS BRANCH, MINISTRY OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

We have passed through a period during which the funding of colleges has undergone several changes, so I guess I should start by doing a very short "Once upon a time".

Once upon a time we had a thing called open-ended funding. We had a formula which, if you summarize it very crudely, says, "You started with activity (which was given), there was a rate per unit of activity at which it was funded, and that rate was based on the actual expenditures in the college system. We then multiplied the activity by the rate and we arrived at the amount of money that we needed". Somewhere in the course of the year we went hand in hand to Management Board for additional money to meet any short-fall, and after a reasonable amount of argument we got it.

Then the formula, with more or less the same components, was reversed. Instead of the activity being the given, the amount of money that we would get became the given -- and we had to design a method for distributing it. After a brief interlude, the method of distribution is again related to activity. If we do the appropriate division, we can arrive at a "rate" of funding per unit of activity, but the rate is really

a little academic. What we really have is a pre-determined sum of money, distributed by the best and most acceptable method that we can operate for the time being -- and that method, of course, is always in the state of development.

Now, before we come along to our college portion, we have already been through a number of processes. I use it in this context very loosely to mean the government scene.

Our total amount of money, whether we like it or not, is a pretty reasonable approximation of what our politicians, as the best experts available, have decided that the public think we are worth in relation to all other things which the government pays for. We know we're worth a hell of a lot more, but unfortunately we're not the people who have to be convinced. The great mass of people have to be convinced, and therefore what we are getting is a measure of our perceived worth, and we are stuck with the job of operating within the funds which that measure suggests.

Having been told what we are deemed to be worth, we try to find the most logical and/or acceptable method of distributing it amongst the colleges. After that, of course, there is another distribution -- within each college, at the discretion of the people who operate

the college. They operate as individual units, so inevitably there are different intra-college practices, but we are not concerned with those today.

And as Doug says, the constraint of funds may well lead to either the system, or the Ministry, or some other device, having to look at a process of rationalization of some kind. Although that kind of thing is down the road, I think it's the kind of thing that has to be very much present in our minds when we think about the way we use our limited funds.

There are three components of the financial scene.

First of all is our need to distribute the money. Having distributed the funds, it is necessary to use them as efficiently and effectively as possible. At the present time at least, this is very largely the function of the individual college administration.

We then come to the third and rather sensitive component: accountability.

Approximately $500,000,000 in operating grants and training money is going into the colleges. The taxpayer is increasingly inclined to want to know where those funds went and what they were used for. I think that we have to expect an increasing demand for accounting systems that will enable us to demonstrate

where the funds have gone and what we have got in return for them. I think that we, as a system, need to be thinking right now about how we calculate, how we present, and how we give integrity to the information which will tell the public whether we have done our job. Although we do these things now, we have to develop still better ways.

When we get into this measurement business, we invariably get to the topic of productivity. What do we get for the money? How do we measure it? How do we get some kind of unit measurement which will say,"yes we are doing a good job, yes we are producing something as economically and as well as can be done"? Are we supplying the right end product?"

A few years ago, there was public debate on the question of graduates. Were we really in the business to produce X number of graduates? Was the ideal that 100% of the people who went into the first year should necessarily go out with a piece of paper at the end of the second or third? I think that the answer was very decidedly no. If part way through the operation somebody finds himself equipped to go into the trade, profession or job, of his choice, then the fact that he did it in a year and a half instead of three years is not a confession of failure, but a confession of accelerated success. But do we still agree? And how

do we measure success? By what standards are we measuring? What is really our unit of production? What is our objective?

We must have a reasonably determined objective (even though someone is always going to disagree with it) which will enable us to measure success or failure, and to produce cost information which will enable people to see that they are getting their money's worth. Meeting our obligation to account might, just might, help to get us nearer to our conception of adequate funding in subsequent years. Maybe if our financial information is good enough and digestible enough we might just stand a little bit better chance than we did before when we go into the ring against, for example, hospital requirements.

Financial planning and administration, particularly in times of constraint, seem to consist very largely in the resolution of apparent contradictions. I have enough listed here to keep me talking till 10:00 p.m., but a couple will suffice as illustrations of what I mean.

Before I deal with my examples, I would like to deal very briefly with the relationship of funding to planning, since planning is essentially trying to resolve the contradictions in advance. I am frequently asked, "How on earth can we plan when you don't tell

us what money we are going to get? We're stuck with this year-to-year business, and we can't plan unless we know exactly what's going to happen next year".

I think the answer, such as it is, lies in the fact that an operation which now commands $500,000,000 a year has a certain amount of inertia built into it. There is a limit to which you can have violent fluctuations thrust upon you. It is highly likely that one can deduce from common sense enough information to do sensible strategic planning within the college operations -- strategic in the kinds of programs that you will go through.

Our discussions yesterday, and I'm sure today, will indicate activities which have to be undertaken whether we like it or not. We know we have to find ways of undertaking them. We know, therefore, that we will have to find ways of getting out of some of the others, because of the message of joy which Doug gave us. I'm sure he's absolutely right, and that we will be asked to do more with less. Tactical planning in the terms of just exactly how to do it gets much more difficult. I realize that. And fine tuning is utterly impossible. But I do think that we sometimes throw our hands up a little too easily when we don't have sufficiently precise information. The art of

financial planning is not the art of reading the past; it is the art of preparing for the more or less immediate future.

Now let me turn to a couple of the contradictions which we have to deal with. A few are symptomatic of the many.

The first one that I'd like to look at briefly is the question of rationalization. We hear an awful lot about rationalization, particularly of expensive courses. Wouldn't it be lot cheaper if one college instead of two colleges provided a particular program? I would have to admit to being a little bit skeptical. I am sure that colleges themselves internally, do an awful lot of rationalizing already, and some inter-college rationalization has already been done quietly and effectively. Highly expensive operations are things that you don't go leaping into; they are the kind for which you look for front-end funding. If you're looking for front-end funding you are preparing your application for approval -- and, consequently, there is a gathering process, a certain amount of rationalization which goes on already.

In order to rationalize anything system-wide we have to have some kind of central machinery to do it. That costs money, whether it is done in the Ministry, the colleges, or some combination of both. Now one

of our objectives must be to ensure that operating funds are used as far as possible to provide educational activity rather than the administration that supports it. Therefore we must guard against the establishment of a "rationalizing bureaucracy" which eats up the savings. A bureaucracy has to operate somewhere, and we can get into salaries, accommodation and travelling -- and before we know where we are, we've spent a quarter of a million dollars to rationalize our way out of $50,000. I'm not arguing against rationalization -- indeed it is essential -- but I'm saying that it must be approached with very great care to ensure that it makes a substantial net saving. I single that one out particularly, because one does hear an awful lot about it.

The other contradiction which I will bring forward is one which I think is going to hit us very hard and very soon. It was discussed quite extensively yesterday and this morning. It is a combination of growth and admission policies. There is a point at which constraint and free access become incompatible. The marriage at the moment is a little difficult from time to time, and a few infidelities have crept in. Consequently I think that the basis of admission will have to be very, very seriously looked at.

We have a dilemma which we might very crudely describe as economic vs. ethical, or economic vs. social. In a competitive society, particularly at this time, it is one of our greatest priorities to produce people who can go into the workplace and quickly be useful. The more acute the need, the more we are forced by the facts of life to lean in that direction. Because of that, it is highly likely that some of the socially desirable elements of the college operation, sad though it may be -- may have to be sacrificed to economic necessity and that this melancholy past will be reflected in our admissions policies.

We use the term "admissions policies", but when we get down to really looking at it very closely, we're talking about "exclusion policies". We're talking about the people who do not get in. And we could create, in the course of examining this kind of consideration, a new problem altogether -- that is the problem of what happens to the people who don't make it into programs for which they consider themselves qualified.

In the discussions yesterday, the matter of technology brought a whole raft of questions -- many, many more questions than even embryonic answers -- and they are serious questions that will need money to solve. But whose money? I don't know, but certainly

the problem is there. We cannot simply cream off the best, the most technically able, the most managerially able, and leave the rest to sink. Something still has to be done for the average.

So in closing my talk about operating funds I would like you to think about the very great care with which we will have to deal with the question: "What goes into the economically necessary -- what goes into the socially desirable, and from where does it come?"

FRIDAY LUNCHEON

Chairman: Bill Case
President of ACAATO
and Past-Chairman
of the Board,
St. Clair College

Speaker: Bill Fox
Director General
Labour Market and
Benefit Programs
Canada Employment & Immigration

BILL FOX, DIRECTOR GENERAL, LABOUR MARKET AND BENEFIT PROGRAMS, CANADA EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION

When I was asked to speak to you today by Mr. Hamblin, I certainly hesitated for a moment -- for the timing of this event is, indeed, very critical. As you know, two task force reports have recently been released -- namely the Dodge and Allmand Reports.

The first is a Departmental study that examines the Federal role in what is considered to be an area of Federal responsibility, cognizant of the reality of the limited financial resources that are available. The Allmand report, as you all know, is a Parliamentary study that examined the issues, rather than the levels or degrees of responsibility in a Federal-Provincial context, and of course without consideration for associated costs.

Neither report represents Federal government policy at this time, and I will refer to them in this light. These two reports, however, could have a very significant impact on the formulation of policies, the extent of which at the moment are unknown.

My hesitation at being with you today did not last long, because there are a number of issues before us which will impact on the nature and extent of adult training in Ontario. As a member of the Federal-Provincial team involved in the training and skill development of the province's work force, I felt that I should share my

thoughts with you in an atmosphere of constructive analysis of the past, and of hopefully constructive planning of the future.

In the late 1970's several reports, such as the Robertson and Ickerson Reports, were commissioned to examine the existing labour market balances. Critical issues were clearly identified -- the lack of industrial human resource planning; the existence of critical occupational shortages; and the inadequacy of occupational supply sources, both domestically and internationally. This led, as you know, to the introduction of the Ontario-Canada Employer Sponsor Training Program, known nationally as Critical Trades Skill Training.

The approach here is based on target fianancing to address critical labour market imbalances as a matter of priority. The approach, in addition, involves the principle of occupatonal zero-base budgeting, and multi-year financing.

While this experience was targeted to occupations predominately learned on the job, it led to a greater involvement of the colleges in the total training domain, and resulted in improved participation and increased business to a majority of the colleges in Ontario. Such changes need not, therefore be viewed as threatening. They should be considered as opportunities -- because for the total training activity, both industrial and

institutional, must be increased if we are to establish a strong domestic supply source of human resources on which manufacturing and industrial bases depend.

Now that the Parliamentary and Departmental Task Force reports are published, they appear to support the concepts and the strategies of EST, which both Ontario and Canada have introduced.

We all remember the social and economic environment, and the characteristics of the labour market in the 1960's and 70's. Before I reflect on the projections of the eighties, let me briefly summarize the developments over the past two decades.

The last twenty years were characterized by a high rate of growth in the labour force averaging three percent annually. While the participation rate remained, on the average, at fifty-five percent, there has been a gradual but noticeable trend -- male participation declined in percentage terms as female participation in the labour force increased. The accelerated labour force growth in the early part of this period stemmed mainly from the growth of domestic source population as the baby boom generation reached working age. However, net immigration during the same period accounted for .4 percent in the early seventies and fell drastically in the latter part of the decade.

The labour force growth was supported by strong domestic demands for goods and services. This resulted in increased demand for public services such as health and education -- and, thus, the establishment of the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology in Ontario and similar institutions in other provinces.

During the first two decades, our training policies were designed to effect a resolution of the specific demands of the labour market and the absorbtion of massive labour force growth with a minimum of social disruption. We therefore concentrated on entry level skills and relied heavily on apprenticeship training to address the demands for high level skills.

The labour market development in the eighties will create other problems, present new opportunities and challenges, and elicit new approaches. The Parliamentary and Departmental Task Force Reports project similar scenarios for the labour market development in the eighties. These studies suggest that the labour force will grow at a much slower rate. Seventy percent of that growth will be accounted for by adult women; the youth population will decline and, in relative terms, the labour force will grow older.

These trends are already reflected in the declining enrollment in the school system and in the composition of

the private sector advertisements on the television. From these ads one now gets the idea that society is becoming increasingly tolerant of accepting the notion that life goes on beyond the age of thirty.

The demand, or employment growth, in the eighties seems likely to be more highly concentrated on goods producing industries. These industries have to adjust to a world economic environment marked by high energy costs, lower tarriff barriers and stiff competition. To maintain their competitive edge, Canadian industries must move quickly in the field of automated robotics, micro-electronics, bio-engineering, and tele-communications as represented by Telidon. In addition, energy related industry will expand in the Western Provinces and in Ontario. These economic activities will have regional implications in the context of labour demand and the flow of workers from slower growth areas to faster growing provinces. New technologies will increase the displacement of workers and make the coexistence of relatively high unemployment, and critical shortages of skilled workers, more apparent. The occupational distribution of labour demands suggest a slower growth among highly qualified occupations -- with the notable exception of engineering and scientific occupations -- and a sustained growth among highly skilled occupations.

The general implications of these trends for labour market policies are clear. Policies should be directed to

improving occupational and industrial mobility of workers, and to improving mechanisms for retraining and ensuring transferability of skills. Policies should be directed to integrating women and native people into a broader range of occupations, especially non-traditional occupations. This, of course, relates directly to an increased enrollment of these target groups in a wider range of training and educational programs. The onus will be on the adult worker to adapt to industrial and occupational changes. And while they will have to move to areas where jobs are available -- and to accept retraining for new occupations -- the training and educational systems must be flexible enough to respond quickly to the individual's needs, and to new and emerging industrial requirements.

From the analysis of the labour market developments in the eighties, the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology could realize opportunities for expanded activiites. If we are to help meet Ontario's labour demand -- and alleviate the current and potential shortage of highly skilled human resources -- with limited training funds, it becomes our collective responsibilty to prioritize and target the allocation of available dollars. Training must be provided to support a smooth functioning of the labour market. Skill shortages

will have to be alleviated when and where they occur. Training courses should be developed to support the occupational demand for high level skills for existing emerging high technology industries. This will have to be developed in an integrated and co-operative mode between industry and the training institutions. In the context of labour market supply and demand in the eighties -- and in the absence of precise information as to when and where the demand will occur -- the delivery of training must be flexible and adaptable. This, of course, will present a challenge to the college system while recognizing its constraints and operational limitations.

According to the task force reports, the purchase of low level skill courses should be reduced, and the responsibility for training in these basic skills should be shifted to the employers. Funds should be redirected to support selected training systems and programs to meet existing and future shortages of highly skilled individualized trades. Increased funding could be obtained from the user, namely the trainee and the employer.

Middle and high level skill training programs normally consist of two phases: insitutional and industrial. Planning for the purchase of institutional training must be done in conjunction with a plan for a provision of the second phase of the program in industry.

This requires co-operative approaches and an integration, on our part, of CMTP and CMITP in a mode similar to apprenticeship training. Because the industrial training phase of these high skill programs is dependent upon industry participation, and this in turn is a function of the economy, counter cyclical measures should be introduced.

Off the job training in your colleges and industrial training centres such as Hamilton and Windsor, in employer or union centres, should be supported. The volume of training in these high level skills and high technology occupations should be increased considerably. The colleges could, indeed, consider the emerging trends as opportunities as you have already experienced with the Employer Sponsor Training.

At the technician level, we have attempted this year to increase the purchase of accelerated engineering technician's programs. These programs were pioneered, developed and delivered since the early 1970's by Loyalist College. The idea here is to accelerate a sixty week program into a fifty-two week program. The target population is those mature individuals who have related work experience and wish to pursue college training which they could not have had otherwise.

Now shouldn't these graduates of accelerated work programs be entitled to the same college diploma as your traditional student? An equivalent certificate would not be recognized by industry nor by some of the associations,

and this could be a barrier to employment. The accelerating aspect of these programs could be deleted under the proposed amendments to the terms of the AOT Act which would permit the purchase of training beyond the current fifty-two weeks. However, the principle of giving credit for previously related experience remains a valid one and indeed, central to the concept of recurrent and co-operative training.

One of the issues which needs to be addressed is the purchase of BTSD. While a Parliamentary Task Force recommends increasing the expenditure of BTSD, the Dodge Report argues that, on a priority scale, resources directed to BTSD should be reduced. Current policies require that BTSD be directly linked to the provision of skilled training. This year's goal in Ontario is for BTSD not to exceed twenty percent of the skilled training purchase.

In a period of financial constraints, different ways for the provision of BTSD to help the trainee cope with the requirements of skilled development should be explored. I'm sure you will agree that correspondence courses, or self study material, could be very useful in this regard. It may also be possible to integrate the essential elements of BTSD into the curriculum of skill courses themselves.

Given the complexity and volatility of the labour

121

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

market in the eighties colleges must consider that, besides their local autonomy there are provincial needs and priorities which may not be apparent from a local perspective.

Regional training needs cannot be addressed in each and every college. Thus, issues such as college specialization, inter-college competition, and selection mobility of trainees must be carefully considered and resolved. If training is to remain an important instrument for the labour market adjustment, and for reaching economic goals, the pattern for training budget allocation must be more directly related to labour demand and to the alleviation of skill shortages. Regional shifts are likely to occur, and individual colleges should be prepared.

Also, the mix of training within CMTP and between CMTP and CMITP should reflect the labour market needs. It is imperative that industry assume its natural responsibility for developing its own workforce. The industrial training capacity must be expanded and its quality improved. A lasting industrial training capacity and capability must be developed and supported. The colleges, of course, have a major role to play in this regard. The provision of institutional components for every industrial training plan to ensure that the theories and knowledge are effectively incorporated,

should be seriously examined.

Learning material conducive to the industrial environment should be developed and provided to the employer and their trainees. The provision of a "train the trainer" concept in terms of courses is, indeed, essential if we are to help small employers do a better job in training his or her employees.

These ideas have frequently been discussed in the past, but little interest was generated. The expansion and improvement of industrial training in Ontario is critical if we are to maintain a strong manufacturing base that supplies the rest of the country (as well as exports) machinery and durable goods. An increased volume of training and industry would undoubtedly lead to an increased volume of training in the colleges and other training institutions.

As you have already identified in your background papers, the social, economic and technological enivronment in the eighties and beyond, which we have also identified as relevant to our responsibilities, will require innovative, lateral and multi-dimensional thinking. The college system in Ontario has always demonstrated this ability whenever it was confronted with a challenge. It is time for all of us to pool our resources together and to co-operate more closely than ever before, and to

streamline the communications between all parties concerned, including industry. We should then be able to sustain, and hopefully strengthen, Ontario's economy and indeed the economy of the nation as a whole.

124

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A RESPONSIVE SYSTEM

Chairman: Dr. Charles Pascal
Executive Head, Graduate Studies
Ontario Institute for Studies
in Education

Panelists: Bill Case
President of ACAATO
and Past-Chairman
of the Board
St. Clair College

Norm Williams
Chairman
Ontario Council of Regents

Bill Cruden
Chairman, Committee of Presidents
and
President
St. Lawrence College

Ken Hunter
Skills Development Division
Ministry of Colleges and
Universities

DR. CHARLES PASCAL, ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION

Obviously, the planners of this conference wanted, by the design of these panels and the time allotted, to simulate the expectations of college management today, and that is trying to do more with less. So I'll try to do justice with the two questions with my under-funded time allotment. I've rationalized my comments, trying to eliminate points that others can make more effectively than I. I have cut away many, not all, redundancies within the talk. I've developed and validated a multi-minute plan, and should I deplete my allocated resources without getting the job done, I shall resist the very tempting deficit spending strategy, and I certainly shall not blame you, Dr. Fisher for my inability to learn how to face the challenge of taking full advantage of the creative opportunities provided by trying to say something important in ten minutes.

I'm going to make some comments which can only be construed as negative, and I underscore what Norm Williams said at the outset that perhaps we're not underscoring as often as we should, the many things that we do exceptionally well. I take that as a

given, and I know you do as well. But my comments might be a bit negative. Please remember that they're offered by an unabashed optimist who believes that the best defence is a good offence.

The conditions under which boards and their chief executives governed and managed in the sixties and the seventies are so different from those which are current and projected that we must carefully, thoroughly and honestly address the attitudes and assumptions which formed that behaviour, and we must examine the structure which provides the preconditions for the desired modes of action.

The eighties will be obviously, the decade of accountability. The word evaluation will be bandied about by those who know what it means and know how to do it; it will also be bandied about by those who don't know what it means and don't know how to do it. It's also the decade of litigation in which everyone will be suing everyone else. In short, the pressure for all of us, at all levels of our educational system, will be to do what we do well, and to be able to demonstrate that we do it well.

Both of the questions to the panelists today involve discussing the word "system". System can mean a set of principles and rules to show a logical plan linking the various parts. A system is also defined

as an organized group of inter-connected units arranged to work together for a common purpose. The simple but crucial task at hand for this conference, and for the next two or three years, is to turn this system of colleges into a college system.

Question 1: How well are we doing now?

Structure, decision-making, rules, and approaches to management and governments must be appraised in relation to the consequences they promote. Here are some of the things I've observed. Perhaps some of you think I'm observing it from the side lines. So be it. But I observe that there's too much energy expended on jockeying for power and precious little energy devoted to deciding what to do with the power if you had it. Our non-system is suffering from a bad case of a disease that I call hardening of the categories in which there is too much politics of politics, and not enough politics of substance. There's too much bemoaning the financial crisis, and an absence of creative debate on the educational opportunities provided by the fiscal state of affairs.

The colleges are a part of a zero-sum society and money cannot be treated as a problem. Yes we can generate some additional revenue through creative entrepreneurial, educational activity. Yes, we can do a far more effective job of lobbying, communicating to

governments that our colleges and our human resources are an Ontario-Canadian issue. But the gains shall, in the scheme of things, be marginal, and even the most optimistic financial projections will not allow us to manage and govern in the same way.

The current economics is a state of affairs which requires creative, constructive and aggressive adaptation, and an approach to planning which fully integrates financial realities and the educational and social issues of our day. And when people and organizations continue to treat states of affairs as problems, the results are at best frustrating, and at worst destructive.

I also observe that the budget planning processes around the system are characterized by too much cutting where we can cut, and not enough cutting where we should cut. The current scene is fraught with too much confrontation, too little meaningful co-operation; too much business as usual management assuming tomorrow will be an extension of today, not enough management for meaningful change based on those aspects for tomorrow that we can predict. There's too much survival decision making, keeping the lid on for another year, doing all things less well, rather than doing fewer things better.

In the sixties and seventies it was easy for the

players to play the statesmen, and even though some were winning more than others, all were winning.

In this zero-sum society and our system of colleges, there is far too much uneven distribution of the losses and not nearly enough equal access to new opportunities. It's not the situation of the haves and have-nots that troubles me so much, although that's a difficult thing for me to handle because the pre-conditions have been festering for years and the results have only recently become so devastatingly obvious. What does concern me however, is that this naive optimist sees that there's less than unanimous support and effort for all to assist the have-nots. That troubles me.

Exhibit A: The Growth Policy. Some of you may be pleased with the imminent Growth Policy; some of you may not. But ask yourselves what you might have done as a collective, for yourselves, rather than having others do it for you. As Pogo said, or maybe it was one of my other favourite philosophers, Drucker or Gordon Wragg, "We have met the enemy and he is us".

Yes, there is too much lip service to corporate loyalty -- too many destructive end runs, and not enough genuine commitment to the development and maintenance of the system. There's simply a tiny bit too much corporate infidelity.

So much for the good news.

There's too much taking for granted the overly general definitions of the past, and too little emphasis on developing a clear and commonly understood language of the present and the future. For example, is the community in community college the local community? Ontario? or Canada? Or is it all three? What's the proper balance?

I am getting a tiny bit perturbed at the continual assumption that we all know what we mean when we say quality. Quality can be defined in so many different ways. It can be defined by input variables (who's coming and what are they coming with?) by process variables, by delivery system variables, by class size, and by other delivery system characteristics.

And output. Are we all pleased with using placement statistics as the major criteria for success and quality? Fine! Perhaps you are. I think there are some additional kinds of things that ought to be looked at so that with some definitions of quality -- and I think we should do it rather than having others, like journalists and politicians and various other parties, do it for us.

In a collective bargargaining context, confrontational by design, there is too much formal communication designed to win and conquer, and precious little informal dialogue designed to alter attitudes of

people and generate creative ideas for a change. If we are to succeed in a zero-sum society we must co-operatively and aggressively do what we can do well and let others, indeed assist others, to do what we cannot do well. The success stories in our zero-sum society will be characterized by people and organizations who are not afraid to make other people and organizations look good by acting as brokers. And, of course, we need to be rewarded for this brokering behaviour.

Predictions about labour market trends, high technology needs, limited capital investment, altered and redirected Federal funds, all should suggest important opportunities for this broker role. They should not present a threat to yesterday's image of our place in the scheme of things.

Some of the attitudes and behaviour and structures nurtured by the rugged individualism of past decades are simply not appropriate now. While there's a good deal of cocktail party admission on this point, no one group in our non-system appears to be providing creative, substantive and corporate leadership.

So much for question number one. What to do? The range of possibilities is great, from cosmetic to major surgery, from fine tuning to a major over-haul. Any exercise in organizational development, or system

change, must begin with a careful and detailed analysis of the expected and desired consequences. Obviously, from my previous "too much and too little list", I would like to see less from my "too much list" and more from the "too little list". There simply hasn't been enough up-to-date analysis and evaluation vis a vis system goals to have confidence in suggesting changes.

The current system varies markedly with the perceptions of the observer. Some view the system as a pyramid with the Minister at the top of a hierarchial decision system.

Can you image that the same system is also described by others as a wheel with the Council of Regents at the centre of it. Some scribes describe the Council of Regents as the governing body of the college system.

Others describe the system as a tripartite -- with the Ministry, the Council and the college collective as co-equal partners.

Regardless of what people think it is, it is unequivocably clear from the writings and speeches of Davis, Sisco and the Jackson of your choice that the latter view was the intended model. The idea was founded on the notion that having three strong and relatively independent, effective voices, all motivated by a strong sense of corporate loyalty, would create a

dynamic tension which would yield creative and constructive solutions to difficult and contentious issues and problems.

In your documents you have at least two major alternatives. Ken Hunter has provided a few more suggestions to the present structural scheme to consider. Too little time and a bit of discretion on my part prevents me from detailing the changes I believe are necessary. I must re-emphasize that any discussions about changing the structure and decision making procedures must be founded on more than a casual discussion of scenes we'd like to see. Changing structure without this careful and specific statement of desired outcome would be like rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic.

Someone said to me earlier that at least it will give you something to do while you're waiting. But I'm not sure I want to be part of a muddling through exercise.

My bias for the small group activity to follow this session would be to focus at least three quarters of the discussion on specific things that must happen in our system of colleges, and things that must cease to happen and about a quarter of the time discussing the ensuing structural implications.

The development of a true college system is the

issue -- the key to meeting the challenges that lie ahead. I expect that the two hours of discussion will give us a greater understanding of the problem. I do not assume that we will come up with all the answers during the next twenty-four hours, but I do believe that it would be a crime not to take advantage of the momentum that is gained here. I suggest that, as we go into the final twenty-four hours -- while it's very seductive to ask the "so what" question with respect to the conference we should challenge the "so what" question, and ask what you can do as individuals and as a collective, to take forward the momentum that we have begun here.

I believe that one of the major characteristics of any change in the current system must be a kind of collective autonomy of inter-dependent colleges which retains freedom for diversity among the colleges for certain issues, but which presents a common front on matters of vital importance to the system, and a common concern for protecting their very reason for existence. I believe, that whatever comes out of these discussions and beyond this week, there will have to be a measure of controlled co-operation.

I personally have been very impressed with the Government's willingness to invest in this notion of collective autonomy. But the government has also been

consistent about expecting both accountability and responsibility on our part, in return for its investment of both funds and freedom. Either we put our house in order or others will do it for us. And if you have a choice, I assume we'd all like to participate in the changes which have such a direct impact on our respective institutions. I don't think we have much more time to sit around and wait for someone else to fill the void.

Peter Drucker recently said: "the greatest and most dangerous turbulence today results from the collision between the delusions of the decision makers and the realities. But a time of turbulence is also one of great opportunity for those who can understand, accept and exploit the new realities. It is above all a time of opportunity for leadership".

That's our job.

BILL CASE, PRESIDENT, ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES OF APPLIED ARTS AND TECHNOLOGY OF ONTARIO

My comments are flavoured by my experiences over the last two years. As President of ACAATO I am as I call it, the trailer on the bus. I tag along with the Council of Regents from place to place, from time to time, and while they are an august group to look up to with some awe by Boards of Governors, I'm just one of the herd that's there and, as such, people talk to me as being one of the common people. I have, however, enjoyed this last year as it has presented me with opportunities to see and understand the different perspectives held by the different boards. What I'm going to say to you, then, is a bit of a hash of their ideas, spiced by my thought, and given to you to digest.

For starters, I say to you that there is no need for major changes in the system. We have a set-up involving the Ministry, the Council of Regents, and the Boards of Governors that seems to be working reasonably well.

My concern is that we have to keep being responsive to change.

This time of year we see that stock letter from the Council of Regents, asking for nominees to the Boards of Governors seeking community-minded citizens with diverse backgrounds. It's an observation of mine that it is more

and more difficult to get the volunteers to freely contribute their time to Boards of Governors or other bodies. We seem to be in an era where you can get people to take on one shot tasks, but to get persons who will commit themselves to appointments with a potential commitment of six years is getting to be more and more difficult.

In spite of the directive from the Council of Regents about more women on the boards, we find it is difficult to get the ladies to come forth and actually to commit themselves to a Board. It's going to be more difficult to seed the system with new people at the Board of Governors level.

Having got them there, we will somehow have to look to the education process for board members. Some of you have expressed thoughts on the ACAATO conferences, where there's a lot of repetition in what we do. I would like to ask for patience and understanding on behalf of those knowledgable presidents who have to go through this year by year. I also think it takes patience on behalf of the senior board members because, in my view, the programs you put on for the educational process for new governors must be repeated about every three years. You're going to run through the stock things about the relationships between Boards, Council of Regents, Ministry, how to handle the president, things like that. They're going to repeat.

They must repeat.

I've also noted one area of concern in the Council of Regents. It seems to me that there's a flavour in their deliberations -- at times -- to pull some of the strings and bring the rule back to the centre -- that is, the Council. I don't think any Council members are doing it consciously, but I'm always worried when I see the trend to centralization of the process. I feel that the Boards out there in the regions are the true representatives of the community that's being served, and I put the "beware" into my friends on the Council to be cautious when making rules.

The one other area which I think affects us all has to do with the paper flood that inundates us these days. As a member of the Board of Governors at St. Clair, I'm used to seeing a stack of paper, then you move into ACAATO and the stack is a little higher, then as you get the Council of Regents mailings after that and it gets a little higher. Given that I should do some work for myself once in a while, I wonder, after a while, what to do with all that paper. Perhaps some of you have an answer as to how to handle this paper flow. That would be a real solution. I would love to have it.

One final thought in this whole process.

Communication, communication, communication. The Boards of Governors have no real feeling for the Council of Regents or the Ministry. They are faced with personalities off

somewhere who send a letter down -- and they never see them and don't really have a feeling for what they are doing. I know it is difficult, and I know the groups are all busy, but I stress that communiction is the one area where we're all very weak.

NORMAN WILLIAMS, CHAIRMAN OF THE ONTARIO COUNCIL OF REGENTS

The stated objective of this session is to examine -- and more clearly define -- the role of the Ministry, the Council of Regents, the Committee of Presidents and the Boards of Governors in the provincial process. I'm not sure that such an objective requires a great deal of thought because the role of the Ministry, the Council of Regents and the Boards of Governors is enshrined in legislation. So I've therefore reverted from the objective to the topic itself and that's delivery of a responsive system.

I've thought a fair amount about this and I believe we can look at it from at least two perspectives.

The current system is, of course, a triumverate between the three parties that parallels the checks and balance type system that exists in the U.S. Government. It's quite interesting to note that Mr. Davis elected to place in the Act the role of the Minister -- and that means the Ministry as well -- the Council of Regents and the Board of Governors. The role of the Board of Governors, of course, is further defined by the Corporations Act of 1971 and the role of the Council of Regents by Regulation 169. In doing this Mr. Davis obviously didn't want to duplicate the level of autonomy

which exists in the universities, and yet he knew that a totally Ministry operated system was very difficult to operate because thay had tried this with the Provincial Institutes of Trades.

Recognizing the civil service control of system resources he created, by an Act of the Legislature, the Council of Regents represents, separate from the Ministry, a group to monitor the system and to help the Minister in the operation of the colleges.

So we have five groups: individual Boards, the Ministry, ACAATO, the Committee of Presidents, and the Council of Regents -- all of which have to work together, and three of which exist by legislation.

The responsibility of the Boards is to operate courses and programs that are reflective of the needs of their area, within the funds made available by the government.

The function of the civil service is to provide the support to the colleges for administering the funds, and the policies that are approved by the Minister.

ACAATO is an organization of Board Members which meets annually to discuss problems of governance, and problems of the entire system, assisted, of course, by the Secretariat.

The Committee of Presidents have as their prime responsibility their individual colleges and as the

Committee of Presidents they represent, in addition, a prime advisory group to the Government, the Council of Regents and a lot of other groups.

The Council of Regents are, by law, to assist the Minister in the planning and establishment of the colleges.

Giving any of these groups a change in the power that they currently possess would be imprudent, because I think it would upset the balance.

Now before looking to the question of responsiveness to students, let me consider whether the current system has been historically responsive.

First of all, in the past five years the system has grown some twenty-seven percent in spite of financing.

Secondly, there have been two hundred and sixty programs approved in five years, mainly in the technology and business areas. So we <u>are</u> responding to the needs of the Ontario economy.

In my opinion, we don't need to modify the system Rather, I think, we ought to look at how all the players can cooperate to meet the real challenges that lie ahead. And there are real challenges.

On Wednesday of this week, I had the pleasure of sitting in Pheonix, Arizona, listening to Dr. Alvin Bork who is the the Head of the Department of Physics

at the University of California. He was speaking on the coming revolution in education and it was an absolutely excellent speech. Some of the things he said are so parallel to our situation that I'd like briefly to share them with you.

He listed six elements.

First of all, in the U.S. there will be nineteen percent fewer high school students by 1990. He showed the slide and I thought, my God, it's the Growth Study all over again.

He claims that there's going to be a shift in population -- that's demographics -- over the next ten years. Some of you were with me when the Mayor of Metropolitan Toronto told me that there will be a million people move into the area that's bounded by Dundas and Pickering, in the next ten years -- and since we dont't have a large population growth, that means they're going to come from elsewhere. So there's going to be a major demographic shift, just as he claims.

Bork believes, too, that there will be more competing, non-traditional institutions. Many of you don't know that the Wang Institute was set up by the computer manufacturers because they couldn't get enough people to fill the jobs. You have the Holiday Inn Institute and you have the Hilo Institute both set up to compete with the community colleges -- so I agree

that we're going to see some changes.

He predicts increased funding problems.

He claims there's going to be an increasingly hostile public, because business doesn't feel that education is giving them a real bang for the buck.

One thing that he came up with at the end, which I was most impressed with is the phenominal decrease in the cost of computers and the improvement in learning materials. He listed four points that I thought were rather fascinating.

First of all, a micro chip, which five years ago would have cost one million dollars, today costs one dollar. They can manufacture them in the hundreds of thousands. That means that you, within a year or so, are going to have a thing inside your wrist watch which will run 1,000 concurrent users because of the computational power. I think we've only seen the beginning of it.

In the period 1975 to 1985, the Japanese committed seventy billion dollars to the manufacturing of computers and an advancement in the computer industry, and Nipon Electric Company is about to enter the North American market. The projection is that when they enter the North American market, they're going to wipe out every North American micro-computer manufacturer

with their equipment and their manufacturing techniques.

No less than six of the largest publishers in the United States are spending tens of millions of dollars on creating computer learning materials, because they believe that the whole question of computer-assisted instruction is the way the world is going to be going with the micros and everything that is coming down the chute. It is projected that by 1990 there will be seventy million micro-computers in the United States with between seven and ten million computers in homes in that period of time.

Bork beleves that there will be major changes in our education institutions. I know we've all heard this before, but these are the three or four things he suggests:

The greater use of computers in the learning process. Industry is miles ahead of us in this area right now; generally speaking, industry seems to use these new advancements before we do. But I think in terms of the collective bargaining process, we've got to find ways in which to make our people more productive if we're going to pay them the kinds of salaries we do. I'm not suggesting that computers can replace teachers, but I do think that computers are going to make teachers more effective.

More self-paced courses in the curriculum. Again not to replace, but to make better.

New types of institutions with a great deal of learning going on in the home. The technology is there to do that right now, to learn in the home. Distance learning is going to be a major factor as transportation and accomodation costs go up, and computer and communication costs go down.

I don't believe Dr. Bork is alone. If you read that book called World Challenge, you're going to see exactly what I'm talking about.

The other day I was asked to go see a demonstration. Somebody said "Ah yes, but this, it'll never get into the Arts." It was Harriet Black as a matter of fact, and I said, "Oh?" I went to see the demonstration and the guy had an eighty-eight key keyboard that was tied into his computer. It's a Canadian invention and they're trying to market it world-wide. He types into the computer "Channel One" and he plays Beethoven say into channel one, and he says I want it to sound like a piano, so now you've got a piano in channel one. He puts a harpsichord in channel two, puts a violin in channel three, etc. Then he mixes them up and plays them. You've got a full symphony orchestra playing there. By the computer he

can put it in 2/4 time, 4/4 time, 7/8 time, every combination. Then he hits a button, and it prints out the entire musical score for every one of the musical instruments.

It's a hell of a device, but that's the kind of thing that's coming.

So the question is: how do we respond? In posing this question, I'm reminded of a saying in a recent book called God, Emperor of Doom by Putnam that says short term decisions tend to fail in the long term. I think you only have to look at the North American automobile manufacturers when they didn't really compete with the Japanese because they were making all short term decisions.

So we have a situation of financial restraint and a rapidly changing environment both at the same time. To be responsive and to survive, power for making decisions must be left to the Boards. I couldn't agree more with Bill Case. To maintain this, I think Boards have an obligation, in maintaining power, to do some of the following things:

First of all, planning. If there was ever a need for planning, it exists now. You've got the data base. I think you've got to make more use of that.

Secondly, I think you're going to have to make short term sacrifices for long term benefits. Yes, there is going to be cutting of programs, but you're going to have to bite the bullet, because there's just

no money. I think you're going to have to develop more and better solutions, and delivery systems. I think there's going to have to be more voluntary sharing. I think there has to be educational research and development on a level we have never done before. And I think there the responsibility lies at the centre as well as at the Boards. But I think there has to be a new level of co-operation between all those five players, with the recognition that we have to survive.

It's like a baseball team. Everybody can't be the pitcher. A baseball team deploys its resources to field the best players it has.

As my father used to keep telling me: "You know, Buddy, it's one thing to get on top, it's another thing to stay on top." And I think that's what we've got to think about right now.

BILL CRUDEN, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE OF PRESIDENTS
PRESIDENT, ST. LAWRENCE COLLEGE

As the President of a federated college which in many ways is a microcosm of the college system, my comments are influenced by our own experiences at St. Lawrence over the last few years. We've attempted to develop -- amongst what were three very independent campuses which had aspirations of being separate colleges -- a high level of co-operation, co-ordination and integration.

Before I speak directly to the topic, I'd like to clarify my definition of certain key terms which have been used throughout the conference. Those three words are integration, rationalization and responsiveness.

To me, integration is the means by which unity of purpose and action is developed amongst people and organizations in the system. Rationalization refers to program decisions intended to increase effectiveness or efficiency, or both, that occur at the local, regional or provincial level, and that are carried out in the context of limited and continually shrinking resources. Responsiveness is the degree to which we meet the needs of our clients.

The question is raised responsive to whom? It certainly means systemwide and national priorities. It

includes responding to the legitimate needs of students, of employers, of the government and of our communities.

In creating pressure to be responsive at a variety of levels, and to a variety of client groups, we create tension among these competing needs. That tension can be either creative and constructive or it can be disruptive. I think the challenge for us is to make it a creative process.

When I was listening to John Humber this morning as he described the early funding mechanism, a thought was triggered that I would like to share with you. When the colleges were first established, we had virtually open ended funding. We had a high degree of local autonomy in dealing with terms and conditions of employment, and other matters. We therefore had a network of colleges which could focus on being totally locally responsive and which were therefore, highly independent. The actions of one college had virtually no impact on the other twenty-one colleges.

In effect, each college competed only with itself to do the best possible job that it could. We could therefore permit and even encourage twenty-two separate kingdoms and we had some of those.

Today we have a fixed amount of funds which creates a zero sum situation or a win-loss situation -- where if one college gets more, some other college must

get less. It is a situation where collective bargaining is highly centralized, and where almost any action by one college automatically and almost immediately impacts on all the other twenty-one colleges. Thus, through the distribution mechanism, we have promoted inter-college competition, in which there must be winners and losers.

With limited funds and a highly interdependent system now, it's essential that we achieve a high degree of co-operation and co-ordination, and that we achieve a balance between local, regional, provincial and national needs. If both integration and responsiveness are to be fostered, we need to develop amongst all partners in the enterprise -- the Council of Regents, the Ministry, the Committee of Presidents, the Committee of Governors, the individual Boards, and the senior staff -- a number of things which at present we have in widely varying amounts.

We need a common knowledge base, a clear view of provincial priorities and trends. We need mutual trust, respect and openness. We need full disclosure at all levels to promote that confidence, trust and respect. We need integrity. We need a shared purpose and direction, and a commitment to that shared purpose.

We need a willingness to submerge individual interests, and to act collectively in the best interestof the broader organization or the system. We need a situation where all parties benefit from system wide coordination and integration, where in fact we have a win-win situation, not a win-loss situation. And we need the guts to act decisively.

In terms of shared purpose and direction, I think we have two aspects. First - What is to be accomplished? Second: How is it to be accomplished?

The what is to identify and to communicate clearly what must be accomplished by the system and by individual colleges after consultation with the constituency. That responsibility at the system level belongs to the Council of Regent's. That responsibility at the college level belongs to the Board of Governors.

The how, if you will, should be the selection of strategies to accomplish that what. At the provincial level the how should be left to the Committee of Presidents and to the Ministry working in co-operation, and at the individual college level, to the administration. This must be viewed in the context that we have an increasing requirement for concerted action by the system as a whole.

Like other speakers, I do not see the eighties as a period of gloom and doom, but rather as an exciting

and challenging (if difficult) period which can result in a stronger, more highly integrated and a more responsive system. While we have a long way to go in achieving the necessary knowledge base, and achieving the necessary level of trust in developing a shared vision, we have very little time to get there. I believe we have the will and the resolve to get there, and I'll leave the ways and means to the discussions of the individual groups.

Thank you.

KEN HUNTER, ASSISTANT DEPUTY MINISTER, SKILLS DEVELOPMENT DIVISION, MINISTRY OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

I understand I only have ten minutes so I'm going to have to talk very fast. That's what happens when you're on the clean up end.

I put together some remarks on this topic back in the olden days when I was a president and a very important person. I had some reservations about using them because I understand that one of the strictures in the civil service is that you must be very, very careful of what you say. So I want you to forget that I'm anything but a college president and move back in time with me some seven weeks ago so I can say these things safely.

I think, as it has been pointed out, that in the current situation, money is the one constraint that is raised most often. But that's not the sole constraint. There are many other problems, such as the problem of our social environment; the change in demographics; the energy crunch; pollution problems; and problems associated with technological change.

I think that there is clearly a need for system co-operation, versus the totally independent operation. I think that's necessary to alleviate not only the pains and the pangs that we are suffering or are going to suffer, but to maintain our college system's

magnificent health, the kind of health it has had and has shown for the last decade and a half. How is this to be done?

Well, I think there are two ways of looking at it, and two ways in which we have looked at it. One is to look at it in the sense of it's got to be centralized or decentralized; it's black -- it's white; it's go -- it's no go. I submit that that kind of thinking, that kind of approach, is fundamentally wrong.

I think there are a number of things that we should consider.

First of all, centralization means dictation, a need for direction. That's one way to go. That's one weapon, shall we say, in the arsenal of management. There is collective self-discipline, co-operation between, and among, the colleges and the other constituencies that are represented here. There is the matter of the exercise of leadership, wherever that leadership is appropriately exercised. And there is finally, the management weapon, the technique of autonomy.

I think the basic issue is where is each one of these to be appropirately exercised? And I will return to that.

The point was made yesterday that the college system is structured for competition. Murray Hewgill

made that point -- that each president, each board, gets brownie points for doing something that benefits the whole system. And I agree. There are problems in the structure.

I think part of the problem may be that ACAATO and the Committee of Presidents, and the whole sub-structure of the Committee of Presidents, has no legal basis. It's not recognized in any way in the formal structure of the college system. The formal structure is the Minister, the Deputy Minister -- who's the chief executive officer -- and the Council of Regents.

The formal structure has a line through the twenty-two boards and the twenty-two colleges. ACAATO springs up out of this as a self-determined organization, and from ACAATO comes the Committee of Presidents and the infrastructure of the Committee of Presidents of the college system. I think this is a very valuable structure, it's one that has proven its worth, yet it has no legal existence. It hangs out there in thin air.

I suggest that that formal structure needs some attention and I would suggest that the structure should be changed so that the Council of Regents formally recognizes ACAATO. I think it's appropriate that it should be the Council of Regents, because the

Council of Regents does appoint the Governors.

Springing from that, then, the Committee of Presidents has a reason for existence; it provides a different kind of staff input, a communications input to the whole of the system. When the structure is wrong in any enterprise, that may constitute ninety percent of the problem. When the structure is right, that constitutes, in my opinion, about twenty percent of the solution. The eighty percent of the solution comes from people who are ready to work together, who are ready to co-operate, who are ready to communicate, where the structure permits it to work.

The fact that there is a great will to work together and to co-operate, to communicate, is shown by this meeting today, and many more like it where these several constituencies -- even though lambasting each other -- do in fact come together to exchange ideas, to exchange friendship. And there's nothing new about that. We already have a number of elements that are centrally directed, and I think we might start looking at other areas that would be appropriate to introduce some central direction.

Again without any armour, I'll suggest before the spears may fly, that perhaps there should be a stronger central voice in the administration of collective agreements. I've heard many of you say that. Perhaps

there should be a stronger central presence in the compensation of administrative staff. Pehaps there should be some ways of saving large amounts of money through some centralized purchasing. It's been determined, for example, that with microcomputer purchases alone, the college system over the next few years could save millions of dollars jointly through some collective mechanism. Those are a few suggestions for appropriate centralized functions.

Secondly, there is appropriate leadership -- an exercise in giving directions and setting guidelines. I think there are a number of areas where that could be looked at. There are areas that are appropriate for self-discipline, for the cooperative role -- areas, for example, like common recording systems. Numbers are numbers, and there's no reason why we should try to obfuscate each other. We may want to fool (as John Humber suggested) the share-holders and other people, but we should not be kidding each other.

Then there are those areas that are appropriately autonomous -- such as all the day-to-day operational matters, and the allocation of individual college resources. We're already doing all of these things. I suggest that we need to study more carefully other areas in which these management techniques would be appropriate.

I believe -- provided we recognize the fact that we have a management continuum, not an either-or situation -- that we can overcome the present paradoxical situation in which we find ourselves.

FRIDAY DINNER

Chairman: Norm Williams
Ontario Council of Regents

Speaker: Dr. Ian Macdonald
President
York University

DR. IAN MACDONALD, PRESIDENT, YORK UNIVERSITY

There are a number of topics of broad and significant importance that I want to talk about this evening. I hope you will, therefore, bear with me to listen to the argument that I wish to formulate which I believe, and I hope, is of as much interest to you as it is to me.

Last Sunday afternoon I had the privilege of sharing the platform with an American college president for the purpose of giving keynote addresses at the opening session of the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Association of University and College Business Officers, and I was particularly interested in the theme he developed in his remarks. His theme was that a better future will spring from our present adversity.

I've been pondering that proposition all week in the context of the future of Higher Education in Canada, and the more I thought about it the more I'm confirmed in my own position and attitude which I've tried to develop and explain during the last few months to various audiences in Canada.

I'm going to do that again this evening, but in a slightly more elaborate and systematic fashion, and I hope that you'll not think that in doing so, I'm preaching to the converted. Rather, I solicit your

reaction and your views because I've become extremely frustrated and disconcerted by the difficulty we are all facing in convincing the public, and governments of a fundamental proposition. The proposition is simply this: I believe we can have a strong economic future in this province, and in this nation, but it will not happen with the dependability of day following night. Certain conditions are necessary to ensure that it will happen, but we face a serious battle for the creation of those conditions in which economic growth can flourish once again. Prominent among those conditions must be the public acceptance of post-secondary education as a necessary investment in the future.

I believe this proposition must be articulated clearly, and that the onus is upon us to prove the truth of it to the public, and in turn to our governments.

I don't wish to imply that there's not a great deal of effort and energy going into the preparation of economic policy in Canada today, both at the federal and provincial levels of government. I am concerned, however, that the elements of that policy are not properly co-ordinated; that parts are counter-productive; and that we fail to consider the mixture and balance of policies that are necessary to our

well-being. We must correct those shortcomings if we are to cope with the economic characteristices that will prevail through the next two decades and into the twenty-first century. So this evening I would like to challenge some fundamental assumptions, and to take one small step toward a plan for economic development and recovery in Canada.

First of all, let me recite four assumptions that I believe are fallacious. One -- that we can never again have the rates of economic growth or expansion which we enjoyed in the 1950's and 1960's. Two -- that the future for universities should be one of decline and reduction. Three -- that post-secondary education will continue to be the preserve of relatively small proportions of the population. Four -- and perhaps most important of all, that the appppropriate fiscal policy today is one of across the board reductions in government expenditure as the only means of relieving deficits, of reducing the burden of the public sector, and of liberating the private economy to play its proper part in economic expansion.

Let me deal with each of these assumptions in turn.

First, we should decide upon our fundamental objective and, for me, that continues to be a high rate of economic growth. In my observations and conversations with young people, I have become convinced of the

urgency of this objective. If their expectations for the future are to be realized, we must now, in all fairness to them, ensure and sustain a high rate of economic growth in Canada.

Perhaps I should qualify at the outset that the term growth need not imply what it has in the past. We can change the word to something broader and more neutral, such as economic "change" or economic "development". A commitment to growth need not imply qualitatively more of the same kind of economic life we have chosen in the past. For example, the ballet is as much a part of the gross national product as bricks, and microbiology is as important as the production of bulldozers. There is certainly nothing inconsistent in taking some of the grossness out of the gross national product while adding to economic growth and development. In other words, the quality of economic growth, the quality of our lives, is determined by our own social values and attitudes.

I believe, contrary to many studies of the limits of growth, that there is sufficient capacity for economic growth for some decades to come, and that non-renewable resources will not be a constraint on growth in the immediate future. Of course, in the longer term, we must devise the technological means of replacing non-renewable resources, and of greatly

increasing productivity and efficiency in the use and allocation of resources. If we simply accept, as an article of faith, that we must get used to lower rates of economic growth and development, then such acceptance will surely become a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Second, an integral and key factor in ensuring economic growth and development in the future will be investment in post-secondary education. When the oil wells have run dry, our human resources especially in this Province will still be the ultimate source of our capacity to innovate, to adapt, to improve. After all, the history of the world is the history of ideas, and ideas are what we require in greater number than ever before. Now our critics will ask, first, for evidence to support this belief in education as a tool of economic development -- and secondly, they will charge that our investment, during the the 1960's, in the expansion of our universities and the development of our college system, has failed to produce the economic bonanza that was predicted for it by economists and educators alike.

On the first point of education as a tool of economic development, there is a great deal of literature demonstrating the multiplier effects of expenditure on education and the ultimate returns in

economic growth and development. I am surprised that more of this evidence is not adduced when this issue is being discussed publicly.

In addition, it's simply too early to prove, or disprove, the results of the expansion of the post-secondary system in the 1960's. The benefits that flow from investment in education are long term, and afer all, somecne who graduated from a university or college in 1969 is now only thirty-three or thirty-four years of age. We simply need more time before we can measure the ultimate benefits that accrue from the advancement and development of the 1950's and the 1960's.

On the second point: it's true that, when education was undergoing its heyday of expansion, educators and economists alike were recommending, in that unfelicitous phrase, "investment in human capital". There was a disappointment when the investment did not yield the dividends expected. But remember a number of things changed in the 1970's, quite apart from education, which have worked against our economic enhancement in this country. Most important was the advent of the change in the world energy situation in 1973, and thereafter, the major changes in our terms of trade and in our competitive position with other countries in the world. As the

external environment becomes harsher, the internal pressures become greater, and our shortcomings appear more pronounced, and this in turn leads to a progressive deterioration in competition and in competitiveness.

Indeed, our critics will ask a third question: why should we invest in post-secondary education when it merely benefits the select few, while the majority of the population are left out in the cold? Well that, of course, is a fallacy if considering that only the individuals who pass through post-secondary institutions benefit from them. The fact remains that there's scarcely one socio-economic problem today which our colleges and universities are not uniquely well equipped to meet. Indeed they are dealing with these problems daily and, in my view, effectively.

I speak, in particular about our universities as the part of the system I know best, and because they have a particular responsibility for many essential areas of research. Further, I believe that the road to improving the credibility of universities leads not to a reduction in the size or number of our institutions, nor in making accessibility more difficult. Like so many of our generation, I can appreciate personally the significance and feeling of being the first member of

one's family to go to a university. My firm commitment to the concept of accessibility to universities, then is strengthened by personal experience. We should be enhancing the great democratic tradition of this nation by expanding access and bringing educational opportunities to a greater number of people at all stages of their lives.

Finally, the last person, I hope who would fail to recognize a fiscal problem for government is a former Deputy Treasurer of Ontario. You may, of course feel that my credentials are somewaht qualified in that matter. I recall, that some seven or eight years ago, when I became President of York University, a writer in Time quipped that perhaps I represented a new trend in university presidents --those who balanced books, as opposed to those who wrote them. Honesty and integrity obliged me to reply that, whereas I'd edited two books of Confederation essays in the previous four years, I couldn't remember the last time the Government of Ontario had balanced its Budget.

What I understand very well -- and this becomes the critical point -- is the need for government to achieve a higher degree of fiscal balance, and to reduce the relative burden of government on the private sector. But those problems are not solved independently of all others. They take us clearly into

the umbrella question of strategy for the future, and, in any consideration of the future, my foundation stone is a belief in the fortification of our human resources. I believe that, as an article of faith, education is an investment that will produce a higher rate of economic growth, and thereby produce a more favourable fiscal environment for the government in the long run. To continue to reduce the effectiveness of our investment in education, to let our skilled resources and our physical plant run down, is to exascerbate rather than to improve the governmental fiscal problem.

As a student of economic history I've observed that societies have a tendency to take the wrong turn at the wrong time, and public policy tends to reinforce the very problem that we're seeking to solve. Therefore, if we follow policies that serve to diminsh economic growth, we will worsen our fiscal situation because government resources will grow more slowly than the cost of basic services.

Returning to my opening remarks, I can accept the general thesis of adversity under certain conditions, but I do believe that the bracing effect of adversity scarcely applies in our situation where, for seven or eight years, the income of our post-secondary institutions has been somewhat less than the rate of inflation; we are now at the point where we are seriously

in danger of radically diminishing what investment we do have at our very hour of greatest need. I think it is essential for us in this country -- indeed it's our God-given opportunity in this country -- for us to be a pace-setter in the world of technological innovation and in research and development.

In saying that I include the colleges which you represent, because you too provide the essential manpower in many areas where renewal depends upon your strengths in alliance with those of the universities. So let me say quite clearly, I have never seen, and moreover, I do not see today the universities and colleges being pitted against each other in this matter. I hope that in striving for financial or political advantage, we never allow ourselves to fall into the trap of divisiveness.

Surely no one who knows anything about economic conditions in Canada could deny we have a great need for skilled manpower in a host of applied areas. But the future of Ontario, it's economy and society, also depends directly, as never before, on the quality of its human resources and on the availability of what I like to call "knowledge-workers". So we urgently require not less, but in fact more, investment in education if Ontario is to compete in the world economy and recapture it's traditional place in the life of the nation.

I have been truly aggrieved by public spokesmen, who should know better, suggesting that we require fewer persons with a university education because we require more technically-trained people. In fact, those groups are complementary, and the truth is we require more of both: one cannot exist without the other.

Strategic planning for the Ontario economy must involve a mix of enhanced research and development, professional training, technical skills, and general education. It's vital that the urgency of the need for development and expansion of the human resource capabilities of Ontario and Canada be recognized and acted upon immediately, before critical manpower shortages occur in the mid-1980's and beyond.

As a nation in the process of becoming a medium and high technology society, we are critically in need of indigenous entrepreneurs, innovative managers and leaders in the application of science and technology. In fact, I do not believe it is an exaggeration to say that, in order to get through the next decade, let alone the 1980's and into the twenty-first century, we will require skilled manpower of all sorts on a scale never before contemplated in this country.

Are we ready for that?

Do we recognize it?

Are we committed to it? Because if we are, we must maintain and improve the stock of capital in our post-secondary institutions.

We all know that the world of government today is full of contradictions. It's curious to observe the type of manpower planning to which the Federal government now seems committed, and the type of skills that it recognizes will be required, while at the same time it contemplates reductions in contributions to the operating costs of colleges and universities that would make our institutions virtually impossible to operate. Thus , we could not provide the environment and the facilities within which the very manpower planned for, along with the accompanying research and development, could be produced.

What conclusion do I draw from this?

I believe that Canada needs nothing less today than a national economic strategy and a national economic conference. I'm not implying, that there are not many good ideas emanating from the Federal Government about manpower planning and economic policy. In this province, the Government has given imaginative leadership in the BILD program and in the IDEA Corporation, which is currently being formulated to bring together the best in our university research capacity with the most promising economic opportunities

in the private sector. Within our colleges and our universities we have the manpower, the environment and the commitment to add to Canadian innovation and improvement.

Thus, my purpose this evening is not to assault governments for stupidity, short-sightedness or incoherence, which is certainly a common pastime today. Rather, I wish to make an urgent plea for both levels of government, along with representatives of our institutions of higher education, to collaborate in working out a national strategy.

The appalling waste and the attendant social problems spring today from the fact that the two levels of government and our institutions of higher learning are becoming locked into confrontations each with the others -- and that is a lamentable condition for this country because I believe we all share a common goal. Our true points of contention are, or should be, our means of achieving that goal and the cost of doing so. And this fractured thinking is immensely frustrating, especially in the tragic waste of resources that will be the result of it.

Of course the problem is large and complicated, but I firmly believe that we should sit down together and decide: one -- on a realistic set of economic goals; two -- on the best means of achieving those

goals, and three -- on the extent of fiscal support that will be required to reach those goals. Then we should demonstrate to ourselves, and to the public at large, the credible plan of action.

However, we must be cautious about the environment in which we tackle this task, because as I see it, we are afflicted today with formidable misconceptions which seem to paralyse the creative process and our endeavours to break out of the paralysis. For example, in the first place, the demographers tell us that university enrollment will be down; therefore the universities must shrink. This, of course, flies in the face of the facts right across the country this year, including those of my own university.

At York University this academic year the number of first year students whose home Faculty is Arts has increased by thirty-three percent over last year, and at Glendon College for bilingual studies, the overall increase is slightly over fifteen percent.

Moreover, the argument runs that such resources as are assigned to universities and colleges should go principally in the areas of applied science and technology and into the technological arts. That view, of course, fails to recognize that the applied sciences and engineering are all, in one form or another -- as

indeed are our professional faculties -- founded on the general arts and sciences.

The fact is we simply cannot be effective in the one area without supporting the allied work in the other area. This argument is fortified in turn by the first condition -- the fact that enrollment is generally up in almost all areas. Now, of course, the demand is much greater in a variety of applied areas, but in those cases the great impediment to producing manpower of high economic value is the shortage of facilities and our failure to invest sufficiently in them.

In summary, then, we tend to deal with short-term conditions as a guideline to future policy and to undertake static analysis, rather than to deal with the economy as a dynamic process. That leads me to a further example of policy inconsistency. Today, the Prime Minister of Canada is telling the world that a high priority in Canada is to support the development of the Third World. We have, at the federal level, the provincial level, and in the private sector, trade missions in motion around the world all the time, seeking new markets and business ventures. At home, there is a real possibility that the increasing numbers of mature students, and a higher participation rate, will not be sufficient to offset the excess capacity predicted for the later 1980's in our universities as a

result of demographic changes.

Surely, then, the answer to all of these problems is to improve our record in providing opportunities for foreign students in Canadian universities, and yet at this time the tendency is exactly the opposite. To increase the price and to reduce the opportunities for those students, I think, is puzzling and disappointing, not simply for altruistic reasons, but for hard, practical reasons of self-interest.

In Third World countries, great disappointment is being expressed that Canada is following this route simply because it's the route being favoured by Britain, Western Europe and many other parts of the industrial world. Here we have a glorious opportunity to set an example and to discharge our international responsibilities in a manner that brings benefit to foreign people while enhancing our economic interests.

Why do we not do so? Because, I think in all of these matters, the great problem is excessive present-mindedness. We look at the symptoms of economic malaise, inflation, unemployment, regional disparity, employment gaps, shortages, and so on, and we tend to ask: what remedy will bring down the temperature, or give us some relief, and prevent the worst symptoms of the disease from overwhelming us?

That is laudable, sensible, understandable -- but the problem is that it does not provide a course of action to improve the long-term health of the nation. That can only be done, as I suggested at the outset, by the systematic embrace of certain goals for economic growth and then a consideration of how we can enable the economy to reach those goals.

Finally, let me disavow one possible implication that might be taken from what I have said. Am I advocationg a more interventionist role for government? Quite the contrary. Indeed I share with many others a concern that we'reattempting to do too much by government in Canada.

The other day we had the privilege of receiving from the Max Bell Foundation a research grant of some $800,000 to establish a research program on Business-Government Relations at York University. I made the remark, on receiving that contribution that my only concern was that given the rate at which government was intruding on private sector we might be obliged to transfer the program from the Faculty of Administrative Studies to the Department of Archeology, before we were finished -- so endangered a species is Business in Canada!

So I share with many others a concern that we are attempting to do too much by government in Canada. I fail to see what fundamental improvement the

establishment of Petro-Canada filling stations on various street corners will really accomplish for the economic life of this nation.

Rather what I'm suggesting is: one -- that we need a greater measure of economic co-ordination among governments and our centres of higher education, and two -- that we tailor our policies to achieve greater effectiveness and efficiency in the use of our resources, but only after we've established clear goals, and the level of commitment we will make to the economic growth process.

One of my favourite recollections from my days of teaching in the University of Toronto many years ago was of a very elderly, somewhat absent-minded professor who lived on Toronto Island. The story is told that one morning he was a little late, and came hurtling down to the dock. He saw the Island Ferry there, about two feet out from the end. With an heroic leap he got over the rail and collapsed in a heap on the deck. The deck-hands picked him up and dusted him off -- and he looked up at them rather sheepishly and said: "Well I made it". One of them said: "Yes sir, but why didn't you wait till we were right into the dock?"

Well, I believe that Canada has a great economic future, but one that could slip away from us at the dock far too quickly, and far too easily unless we determine to play a major role in controlling it, and unless we take hold of the boat and decide which way we want to steer it.

When I left Queen's Park over some seven years ago now the most common question I was asked was: "Why would you want to leave your lofty position in the public service of Ontario to take on the difficult job of being president of a University?" The most common question I've been asked for the last seven years, is "Why on earth do you stay in such a miserable job?"

The same answer applies to both questions, because I believe, fundamentally, that in a country like Canada, the major strength and the major hope we have is in the investment in our people and the creative ingenuity that we can bring to bear in mastering our environment, in enhancing our technology, and in striving out ahead of the world.

In turn, that is the reason I attach pre-eminent importance to higher education. I hope you believe that, if I wasn't in the position that I occupy today, that nevertheless as an economist with some familiarity and experience in the economic life of this province and this country, I would feel exactly the same.

Let us take that message together, both to the public and to governments.

DEVELOPING ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES

Chairman: Ben Wilson
Assistant Deputy Minister
Ministry of Colleges and
Universities

Reporters: David Sutherland
President
Sir Sandford Fleming College

Michael Skolnik
Chairman, Higher Education Group
Ontario Institute for Studies in
Education

Doug Light
President
George Brown College

Dr. Charles Pascal
Executive Head, Graduate Studies
Ontario Institute for Studies
in Education

DAVID SUTHERLAND, PRESIDENT, SIR SANDFORD FLEMING COLLEGE

Summary of discussion groups on
"Program Objectives in the High Technology Era"

I'm very glad this morning to be able to remind you of Harry Fisher's cautionary comment that the success or failure of this conference shouldn't depend on our ability to provide a quick fix.

In trying to summarize the thoughts of a hundred people in four study sessions on such a broad issue as the college mandate, I'm all too conscious that the summary may raise more questions than it answers. Indeed, much of what I report will, at first hearing, sound somewhat like a list of cliches. Perhaps for this summary, and for the others to follow, we should remember that cliches survive because they contain some nugget of truth that's withstood the test of time.

If the words and ideas I present are not particularly new or world-shattering as I present them, I hope you will discern behind them, as I do, a substantial willingness on the part of everyone involved in the college system to be open to change -- and to consider for the future new styles of social architecture in carrying out the college mandate.

There was a general agreement, in most groups, that the legislative statement of the college mandate made in 1965 is still valid. We're still in the business,

and I quote the legislation, "of offering programs of instruction, in one or more fields of vocational, technological, general and recreational education and training in day, or evening, courses and for full or part time students."

However, it is recognized that the social and economic environment in which those programs are offered has changed markedly in the last fifteen years, will change even more dramatically in the next fifteen years, and certainly will require a new interpretation of that mandate.

All of the discussion groups recognized that a trumpet has sounded, but for many people the trumpet is sounding an uncertain note. Some groups talked in terms of a new balance being struck between the various kinds of programs offered by the colleges. Some talked in terms of the need to give even greater priority to the economic imperatives of the time. Some saw the issue in terms of a move from being primarily oriented towards community needs, to becoming oriented towards provincial and national needs.

Whatever the terms used, there was for me a suprising degree of immediate concensus on the idea that the colleges cannot, in future, be all things to all people. However, the new reality for the colleges was not seen so much as some kind of break form the past as a shift in emphasis.

In one group at least, there were strongly stated views that much of the present talk about revolutionizing the colleges to meet the needs of high technology was more than a trifle melodramatic. The colleges, after all, have always been in the high technology fields of the day. Their swift response to the BILD Program suggests that, once the need is defined, the colleges can, and will, respond quickly and effectively.

What most groups were looking for was a clear statement, probably from Queen's Park, but incorporating Federal strategies as well -- a clear statement which spells out in plain terms what the colleges ought to be doing that they're not doing now. What, in other words, are the proportions of the new balance that has to be sought? What must we concentrate on to meet the new provincial and federal economic imperatives? What must we de-emphasize or turn over to others in the years to come?

Every group talked about program rationalization. It was agreed that a regional or provincial pattern must be developed which minimizes, or eliminates, duplication of current programs with low enrollments and, perhaps, redistributes and concentrates at certain colleges viable programs which are one class programs.

For the future, particularly in high technology, a pattern must be developed which allows colleges to specialize. It's recognized that rationalization is a very complex and incredibly thorny issue, but it's one that must be tackled.

There was little or no disagreement with the call for more vertical integration with the secondary schools. All groups saw such integration as wholly benefical to both institutions.

The current attrition rates in many programs in the colleges must be reduced. What many see as a need for more selective admission standards could be incorporated in secondary school counselling and academic programming. A clearly established career continuum from grade nine through the colleges might reduce, substantially, the loss to society of the human potential represented by drop-outs.

Better horizontal integration with the universities was raised in a number of groups, but I could discern no clear definintion of any specific issues there.

As for relationships with business and industry, all groups took note of the discussions in various circles which tend to set up on-the-job training in opposition to institutional training. Most groups felt we should not waste time in futile arguments about which is best, but should concentrate on spelling out which is best for what. There is a legitimate role for on-the-job training. There is a legitimate role for a mix of on-the-job training and institutional training, and a legitimate role for institutional training on it's own.

The important thing in our circumstances today is

that as much training as possible will be undertaken in the most effective mode, whatever that turns out to be.

Finally, if I may be allowed a personal comment, I'd like to sound a note of concern about the number of people both inside and outside the college system who are expressing doubts as to whether or not the colleges are really doing as good a job as they've always been given credit for -- doubts about the relevance of college programs, or the capacity of colleges to devise and operate programs truly geared to manpower needs.

In today's world, with all its volatility and uncertainty, an atmosphere could be created that would breed some rush to judgement syndrome, and produce hasty decisions based on ill-defined or confused thinking. This conference is perhaps one of the best bulwarks against that kind of thinking, but I think the possibility of ad hocery based on press reports can be very disasterous for the colleges in the long run.

With that, this summary is open for scrutiny by the people who contributed to it. I hope you will feel perfectly free to raise hell with it if you wish -- because in the process of amassing it, I remembered the famous definition of fox-hunting. It was the unspeakable in the pursuit of the uneatable.

I had moments when I felt that I would be incompetent in the pursuit of the intractable.

MICHAEL SKOLNIK, ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION

Summary of discussion groups on "Program Delivery in a Changing Environment"

The Thursday evening discussions were designed as an outgrowth of the afternoon sessions on college objectives with an attempt to look at issues pertaining specifically to program delivery in the 1980's.

I think it's accurate to say the environment of the 1980's as far as the colleges are concerned, has changed in several very significant ways. First there is money. Second, there is money. Third, money. Fourth, well you get the idea. I don't wish to go on and add much to the particulars of the gloomy financial forecasts which you've already heard on numerous occasions throughout this conference. I do want to make a few observations about the financial context of program delivery in the 1980's and mention a few other key environmental factors before summarizing the ideas about program delivery which came up in the discussion groups.

First, I think it is important that we avoid a natural human tendency to become totally desensitized to repeated messages of bad news. I don't know about you, but I certainly get tired of hearing about how bad things are likely to be, and after a while my mind shuts off whenever I hear the term underfunding.

I do believe, however, that we are entering a period

of unprecedented cut-backs -- unprecedented partly because there's never been a base so big from which cuts could be made. The difficulty with facing an unprecedented situation is that there is nobody to turn to for advice. There is nobody who has been through it before who can tell us what they did and what worked.

To some people the prospect of a decade or more of under-funding is an exciting challenge. Different strokes for different folks. Personally I prefer a quieter life, like going into the elevator business with George Steinbrenner. Others may see this challenge as a great learning experience.

Kenneth Bolding is one of the noted economists who forecasts a general economic decline. He observes that education is one of the first sectors to experience substantial decline, and suggests that how that decline is managed in education may well set the tone for the management of decline in other sectors.

Whatever the approach, the hope is that the financial predictions -- which we are sometimes given more of than we want -- will galvanize, rather than paralyze and will vitalize, rather than demoralize.

The financial element, however, is only one element in our changing environment. Another crucial element has to do with demographic change. The most striking aspect, of course, is the aging of the population. Several of the discussion groups spent a fair bit of time discussing how

we adapt to the needs of adult learners, particularly on a part-time basis -- not that we we haven't been doing this, but that we're going to have to be doing it more, presumably because of the demographic changes.

The second of these additional environmental factors is the change in public attitudes. We hear a lot today about what is called public disenchantment with education. This came up in several discussion groups, and there was a lot of discussion about various types of grassroots work to change opinions and devise different approaches to public relations and so on.

Some people in the education field get defensive when they hear the phrase public disenchantment with education; they take it as a criticism of what they're doing.

I have a different interpretation. I think that the so called public disenchantment with education, like under-funding of education, is primarily a result of general economic decline and is not a judgment of what goes on in the classroom.

By any type of analysis, the colleges are doing a better job of educating and training people today than they were ten or fifteen years ago. The real change here is not a decline in the quality or relevance of college programs. Rather it is a realization by our society at large that we cannot maintain, or recapture, economic prosperity simply through spending on education.

Education is one of many factors influencing our economic well-being, but if the other spark plugs are misfiring the best education won't do the job by itself. Attention naturally shifts to some of the other spark plugs. Unfortunately, we don't have a very good understanding of what those other spark plugs are.

The other factor in the environment that I want to mention is what I refer to as accumulation of objectives. During the sixties and seventies, various social, cultural and community objectives were incorporated into the operating philosophy of the colleges and endorsed by government -- and came to be taken for granted. Objectives of this sort do not come and go. New ones get added. Old ones do not drop away.

If it is a fact of life that taxpayers do not wish to support the public sector, including education, at it's present scale, it is also a fact of life that vocal client groups do not wish to see the services to which they have grown accustomed, withdrawn. Neither do those who desire personal satisfaction, a sense of contribuitng to society, perhaps a sense of moral rectitude, or simply employment, wish to drop what they are doing.

That, of couse, leads us into the problem of how do we cut the suit from the available cloth?

Two of the major questions in the program delivery discussion groups dealt with program rationalization.

The conference did not produce a tight definition of rationalization. We did, however, reach a concensus that rationalization certainly has to do with minimizing obvious duplication of programs among colleges. It has to do with combining, in some cases, several under-populated programs, into one or two strong programs. It has to do with close control over the introduction of new programs -- perhaps closer control than we have now. It has to do with making sure that all programs are, indeed, meeting clear needs.

However you define rationalization, there seemed to be a consensus in the discussion groups that greater rationalization is a must in today's environment. It is not something that everyone welcomes. People in one sub-group described it as a necessary evil, but something that is coming.

The point was made that rationalization is not a new discovery of this conference or of the 1980's. Rationalization has been going on for a number of years. In a sense there has always been some rationalization going on in the colleges and we have a number of informal networks and informal channels for pursuing rationalization -- but there is a strong feeling that more, and probably a <u>lot</u> more, rationalization will be necessary.

This led us to discussion of some items which in my summary I have to report as unresolved questions. For

example, how much rationalization is enough? Will the existing mechanisms that have been used to achieve rationalization be adequate? If not, how can those existing mechanisms be augmented? Going further, do we need new mechanisms? If we do, what are the new mechanisms?

Interestingly, in the various discussion groups, so far as we could tell as reporters, there was not a strong case made for highly centralized rationalization. It may be necessary, but as yet there has not been a strong case made.

This seems to rest upon two points. One is, as I said before, the judgment is not in yet as to whether the present mechanisms and procedures that have been used for rationalization will be necessary. Indeed, it's pretty difficult to discuss that latter point in the abstract. Much more time was spent discussing how the colleges could build upon their experience with bilateral and regional initiatives to promote efficiency. -- possibly, (in some groups the word was probably) with the helping hand of the Ministry and/or the Council of Regents.

In no way could it be said that there was a concensus on the ideas that were put forward in the brain-storming process on program delivery, though I suspect that concensus could have been reached on a number of items that came up had there been more time to pursue them.

Nevertheless, let me give you a shopping list of some of the things that were raised in the various groups.

To begin with, there seems to be a clear indication of the need for better communication among colleges in terms of program information. We heard the thought that central programs would be useful in helping colleges to work voluntarily toward rationalization. There was, however, no concensus as to whether the principal initiative toward this co-operation should come from ACAATO, the Presidents, or the Ministry.

In some groups if not all, there was a general sense that program rationalization should be carried out first on a regional basis with the colleges in each region taking a strong initiative to jointly tackle the issue. Then we might see how much work remained to do that would have to be done at a provincial level.

In one group we spent considerable time -- and with great interest I might add -- hearing about the experience of the Eastern Region colleges with their regional rationalization. At the same time, there was always that omnipresent thread throughout the discussions, often not spoken very explicitly, but nevertheless there, that if the colleges could not achieve sufficient rationalization by themselves, there would need to be rationalization directed by some central authority. Here in this context we heard what to me was an anomolous if not contradictory phrase, <u>controlled co-operation</u>.

Another idea expressed was that there should be more consistency between programs if, indeed, the colleges were to become more committed to program rationalization -- for example, to make it easier for students to transfer between colleges and to make it easier to consider program co-ordination in the first place.

We heard the idea that the funding mechanism should be revised in order to reward colleges which eliminated or added programs -- in other words to provide a tangible incentive for rationalization rather than to expect great statesmenship to appear in a milieu which only seems to reward self-interest.

In any event, the structure of the discussion groups was such that these and other ideas about rationalization were not explored in as much detail as would be needed if we were going to take action.

Another specific question that was posed was: In what ways can enrollment be managed to ensure the viability of all colleges in the system? As you might expect, the basic assumption of this question, the viability of all colleges, was questioned in some of the discussion groups -- although for reasons of either congeniality or practicality it was not pursued in depth. The thrust in most groups was to look at ways to ensure a flow of adequate funding to the smaller colleges.

The suggestions that were put forward ranged over fairly predictable ground. For example, how about

eliminating Ministry funding for enrollment growth in the first year of programs? How about a more selective funding mechanism? How about central co-ordination of applications and admissions? How about selective adjustment of student aid, depending upon which college a student was going to?

How about, one the one hand, Ministry dictated enrollment quotas? How about, on the other hand, keeping the Ministry out of that and encouraging the colleges on a regional basis to come to grips with the growth issue on their own?

How about steering new and special programs conciously to colleges in need of this kind of support? How about, in a similar vein, making some of the smaller colleges centres of excellence, encouraging them to become visible centres of specialization in certain program areas with unique identities, and then funding them somewhat differently from the present formula?

Once again we had a pot pourri of ideas with, unfortunately, not enough time to pursue particular ideas in detail, because the fount of ideas was so rich.

A final expectation attached to the subject of "program delivery in a changing environment" had to do with alternatives in the actual method of program delivery. For example, relationships between industry-based and institutional-based training. Or another example, how to accommodate the potential

explosion of part-time education toward diplomas and certificates. There was very little discussion of joint programs.

However, two hours is not long enough to discuss everything that one can think of under the heading of program delivery -- nor as I have noticed is it long enough to get concensus on particular points.

On the other hand, twenty minutes is not long enough for me to become an additional discussion group by myself and that's not appropriate anyway.

MR. DOUG LIGHT, PRESIDENT, GEORGE BROWN COLLEGE

Summary of discussion groups on
"Resource Allocation and Maximization"

I will run through the comments made by the five discussion groups first by summarizing the questions which were posed to the groups and then by highlighting some of the more common responses.

First of all, in the groups we talked about the problem which concerned us most -- namely the decline in the value of the funding unit. How do we retard this decline, how do we stop it, reverse it? The associated question was also asked: If it cannot be reversed, what steps can be taken to ensure that the trend does not alter the integrity and the quality of the program?

Most of the responses as to the decline of the funding units took two routes: how to increase revenues, and how to control this decline.

One suggestion was that we should follow the university route: to get publicity and to lobby the government to force our political leaders to give us more money. The rationale for this approach is that we appear to have grassroots support, as witnessed by some 10,000 people in business and industry sitting on our advisory committees, and, the general belief that we seem to be in favour from the public viewpoint.

A second point was a very strong commitment in every group that the decision to control the charges for

part-time courses should be altered to give us more freedom in that particular area. There was, at least in two groups, a very firm statement that more of the financial burden should be passed on to the students, as well as a suggestion that there should be a percentage of our expenditures tied into the revenue from the fee structure.

There was some talk about marketing aggressively to move into an entrepreneurial type of arrangement, and to contract out many of our services on a fee for service basis -- but there seemed to be a general concensus that these routes would have a relatively minor effect on the overall revenue picture.

It seemed to most of us that we recognize that we are facing tight tough times.

The other side of the coin -- having to do with the control or the minimizing of the decline of the funding unit -- came through loud and clear in every group. For heaven's sake, we need a definitive statement relative to growth. There was, however, no reference to any particular mechanism to be utilized to regulate growth. The discussion did range, though, from directives from government to college participation, to something somewhere in between.

There seemed to be a general acceptance -- from a viewpoint of program delivery -- of a need for a very

serious study on the lengthening of the academic year. Much to my surprise, there were very few comments relative to the protection of the integrity or quality of the program. I surmise that this was probably due to the fact that it had been considered by the previous panel.

Then we moved on to the second set of questions which were relative to capital facilities. Basically there are two questions. In what ways might the current capital facilities be better utilized? In what ways might the college acquire the ownership of, or use of, increased capital assets?

Quite honestly, and not surprisingly the responses were relatively mundane -- covering such things as sharing our facilities and better utilization in off hours. One individaul even suggested twenty-four hour utilization of our facilities. There was again that stress on an entrepreneurial use of facilities, with freedom for colleges to contract out equipment or facilities to generate revenue.

Interestingly enough, a common parameter was to give permission to the colleges to sell off or lease excess land to generate revenue for the purchase of equipment. Again, at least two of the groups stressed donations from the business and industrial segments of our society, and there are at least three colleges that can illustrate specific examples of that type of donation.

The point mentioned by Ken Hunter in his address was certainly picked up in at least three of the groups -- that we should move into joint purchasing policies and accrue savings through volume purchasing as we've done relative to the Bibliocentre operation.

We then moved onto the third area which tied into human resources. Basically it was the question of collective bargaining process and renewal of human resources. Much to my personal surprise, there seemed to be a more or less complete acceptance of the collective bargaining process. An occasional comment was made that perhaps we should have more emphasis on the local level, but certainly there was satisfaction with the collective bargaining process (though perhaps not with the results).

Much to my surprise, very few groups, if any, latched on to Bill Newnham's comments about the potential need for legislation on workload.

If I may just put in an editorial comment, I think perhaps Bill is looking indeed to the future. If we trace the history of the Junior Colleges in the States, legislation to predetermine workloads was absolutely necessary. There's no doubt in my mind, and I'm sure in your minds, that the key crunch next year, and in subsequent years, from the union viewpoint will be job security, at the same time we are facing a reduction of the financial base. So I'm certain that it behooves the

government to be prepared for the eventuality of legislation.

There was some concern relative to the fact that it was well nigh impossible to retain high demand type faculty or administrators. I know all of us are facing this in the computer field, for example.

Moving on to the next topic of discussion -- renewal of human resources -- there was much discussion about a human resources inventory for the college system. I guess the view was that there could be exchanges from one college to another when programs were being terminated -- there might be a possibility of transferability of that type of staff.

A very clear message from three groups was that there is a need for each college to move in with a solid plan for staff development, much like the plan that Sault College had a number of years ago for staff renewal.

Several groups also mentioned the need for a de-hiring process or plan. We do have a responsibility to people who've been with us for years and who must be terminated. We should set up procedures and processes to assist them.

Finally we had one other question -- related to the assumption that the part-time adult learner would become crucial to the college system. He or she <u>is</u> at the moment, but will be even <u>more</u> so in the future.

How should we adjust our funding mechanism? Most groups handled that very quickly by saying we can adjust, as required, the mechanical changes in our funding mechanism. But it surfaced very loud and clear, again, that the colleges wish to have more freedom relative to the part-time fee.

So just to summarize what I interpreted from the many responses in the discussion groups, I would mention eight significant points: 1) to finalize a definitive growth policy, 2) major revisions in program delivery, and a host of minor areas to generate new revenue, 3) the ability of a college to sell or lease land and accrue that revenue for purchase of equipment, 4) the opportunity and freedom for the college to act in an entrepreneurial type of activity, 5) a move toward joint purchasing to accrue savings on a volume basis, 6) the possibility, perhaps well down the road, for legislation relative to workload, 7) a definite and definitive type of plan for human resources renewal, and 8) a definite plan for continuing education, with the colleges retaining the right to set the rates to meet the market conditions.

DR. CHARLES PASCAL, ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION

Summary of discussion groups on "Development of a Responsive System"

Before I summarize the range of suggestions offered, I'd like to emphasize, again, the need to avoid structural change unless specific and desired consequences are detailed.

There have been countless examples of pseudo-innovations. In particular, I think, we made more mistakes when we had more money. In the fifties, sixties and early seventies we didn't pause long enough at the problem explication stage before moving to potential solutions -- and so there was a lot of pendulum decision-making about structure, people, and curriculum.

I think we're still capable -- under a different set of pressures -- of making the same mistakes. So I did find that the results of the small group discussions contained too little grounding of suggestions in terms of very specific statements or consequences of what might happen.

I think that, when one talks about the changing structure, it's really a lot easier to talk about making the major changes -- going to something radically different, rather than focusing on some very important fine-tuning. There are also some false dichotomies that continue to abound, and Ken Hunter did a very good job during the panel yesterday in reminding us of them. The

one that he used was the central/decentral decision-making and control.

My assumption is that the current and projected system, regardless of the extent of the changes, will contain a certain measure of each, hopefully for the right issue area.

Let's face it, we're likely to have more centralized leadership in certain areas. But that will always be evaluated in terms of the decentralized effects, so it's really a red herring. If you look much more closely at the issues, they do become obstacles that ought not be there.

The poet laureate of the group in one of the small groups, Laurent Isabelle -- the poet laureate of the Committee of Presidents -- talked about the positive aspects of the pendulum swinging back and forth from central to decentral with the image of the tide going in and out, and in and out, and if we didn't have that phenomenon the beaches would be dirty.

The point is that, when things are not perfect in organizations, it's dangerously seductive to talk about changes in structure, procedures, even people, without careful attention to what is working well, and why, and what specific consequences are intended by the change.

Let me share with you a partial list of "how abouts" in response to the kinds of suggestions that have been made with respect to the system at large. Now there's a

caution here. I want to say at the outset that some of the "how abouts" I will read on your behalf will seem silly, and some of them will seem outrageous.

What is important, however, is to consider what you like about the "how about", however outrageous it is. If you take an outrageous "how about", and then ask yourself what concerns you about it. Something positive may come out of it.

So some "how abouts".

How about MCU, the Minister and the panel awarding three prizes of $250,000, $50,000 and $10,000 for the best corporate effort at local, regional and provincial co-operation? You may think that's silly, but it does raise the question of providing an award for co-operation in some tangible way.

How about the Committee of Presidents being chaired by the Chairman of the Council of Regents, assisted by a strong Secretariat?

How about the Committee of Presidents Chairman chairing the Council of Regents?

How about the Committee of Presidents developing rules and regulations about its own work which have implications for binding voting on corporate issues. It's eighteen to four, that means the four have to go along the with the majority.

How about one Metro College?

How about a consortium of CAAT in different regions organized according to the economic development areas? I think now there are eight, but I'm not quite certain of that.

How about four regional Councils of Regents?

How about bringing faculty into governance?

How about better use of the regional ACAATO groups for issue identification and problem solving?

How about one College of Ontario?

How about forty CAAS with total autonomy?

How about boards with students?

How about electing boards?

How about leaving the system alone, but making sure that each group, reads, understands, and follows its defined roles?

How about recognizing that problems arise when people step outside their defined roles and do end runs?

How about using and strengthening the existing ACAATO regional structure to enhance concensus on a provincial basis?

How about the Ministry placing more emphasis on its role as facilitator?

How about the Ministry doing more information gathering for the college system and sharing it?

How about coming up with ways for the Boards of Governors and the Council of Regents to get together

informally to discuss problems?

How about insisting that all Council members be former members of a Board of Governors?

How about eliminating multi-year planned visits by the Council?

How about the Council of Regents doing an MYP for the system?

How about all the Ministries getting together?

How about the Committee of Presidents developing a committee to self-regulate itself?

How about somebody developing a restatement of the CAAT mission for the 1980's?

How about more decentralizaiton to maintain college autonomy?

How about more centralization to reduce college autonomy?

How about more frequent newsletters from the Council?

How about strengthening the role of the academic affairs area in the system, by involving not just the SAO's but the people at the more direct delivery system operational line?

How about the Council of Regents sharing position papers with others?

How about clarifying the role of ACAATO as a discussion forum and as a vehicle for making recommendations to the Minister?

How about improving the knowledge and skills of Board members?

How about decreasing the sense of territorialism on the part of individual colleges?

How about having smaller Boards, seven in number?

How about having a strengthened Council of Regents with strong, broadly based sub-committees which include presidents, faculty, students, governors with an eliminated ACAATO and Committee of Presidents structure?

How about making the present system work?

And the list goes on and on. But again remember my preliminary caution: yes obviously many of these are contradictory, many of them are silly, many of them are outrageous, but they all have interesing characteristics. You don't have to buy the whole solution as you ruminate beyond this conference. I happen to think the list has some very interesting and promising leads, although I'm disappointed that more of the suggestions aren't pinned to very specific substantive consequences, or things that are related to what we have that shouldn't take place, or vice versa.

I'm quite convinced that, judging by the creativity and energy you've invested thus far, that the conference will provide some very meaningful momentum.

CLOSING LUNCHEON

Chairman: Dr. Harry Fisher
Deputy Minister
Minsitry of Colleges
and Universities

Speaker: Hon. Dr. Bette Stephenson
Minister of Colleges and
Universities

DR. BETTE STEPHENSON, MINISTER OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Most of you know that there is an ancient Chinese curse, and it is this: "May you live in interesting times".

Can there be any doubt that that's what we're doing right now? I think, however, that the interesting times in which we're living are not a curse. I suppose one really couldn't consider them a blessing either -- but there isn't any doubt at all that these times are a real challenge to all of us.

Therefore I must tell you that I'm thoroughly delighted to be here, and to share with you the challenge of the eighties, a challenge which must be met by those responsible for the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario.

I'd also like to congratulate each one of you for the ambitious agenda which was established for this really important conference -- an agenda which I'm sure has stimulated all of you to thinking about items that had not really been paramount in your minds before.

What about the interesting times we're living in?

I doubt that there's ever been a time in the life of the community colleges that hasn't been interesting. Perhaps exciting would be a better word. Exciting would

describe more wholly the creation and the phenomenal growth of the colleges since the mid sixties. There have been golden, heady years in the beginning as the colleges met the needs of the burgeoning baby boom, and again met the explosive demands of a rapidly changing, increasingly technological society.

On looking back, it seems that, in no time at all, we have in place one of the most sophisticated post-secondary educational systems in the world -- I believe second to none in quality. It is a system which, despite the growing needs, has been flexible and responsive to the varied demands which have been thrust upon it with regularity.

Now that has been no mean feat, and all of us should take great pride in that achievement.

Times have changed, rather swiftly for some of us, and I'm sure that you'll agree that they still remain extremely interesting. There is a turbulence -- and I think that's the appropriate word to describe what we're going through at the present time -- a turbulence which demands that we maintain the flexibility and responsiveness which has characterized the colleges in the past. These qualities are going to be even more essential in addressing the issues and the objectives of the future.

I'd like to share with you some aspects of the social and economic climate in which the colleges are attempting

to meet those challenges both at the national and provincial levels, because these characteristics in our social and economic climate have implications for the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, and for all other post-secondary institutions as well.

In the national context, as well as at the provincial level, we are facing a very dramatic demographic shift, in terms of the growth rate of the labour force.

As most of you are aware, in the late sixties and early seventies the average growth rate on an annual basis was about 3.5 percent per annum. By the end of the eighties that growth rate will slow to something less than 1.8 percent per annum, which all of us must recognize as a fifty percent reduction in the rate of labour force growth -- a significant factor for our consideration.

There will be fewer young workers entering the labour market, and two thirds of the growth that will occur will come from the ranks of adult women.

This would suggest strongly that an aging work force will require retraining and readjustment to the marketplace. It also suggests that more and more people, including the adult women and the increasing number of those who will make second, third, fourth and fifth career changes, will look more in the future to the colleges than to the universities for their required retraining and readjustment than perhaps they have done in the past.

Still, in the national context, it has become clear

that we can no longer assume that there will be increases in the labour productivity of the order that we have seen in the fifties, the sixties and the early seventies.

In the past six years, in actual fact, there has been no increase at all in productivity in Canada. In the past two years, there was a decline of approximately four percent.

This means, I think, that we are going to have to continue to restrain our spending at the government level as carefully and as critically as we can. We're also going to have to be more alert, and more ready to take corrective action wherever we identify the need. That ladies and gentlemen is a very real challenge. In this province, however, I think we have more reasons to be optimistic than pessimistic.

Don McGilivary, the national economics editor of Southam News, wrote early in October this sentence, and I'd like to quote it to you: "Reports of the death of old man Ontario, like those of the early demise of Mark Twain, are proving to be greatly exaggerated".

There are figures that bear this out thoroughly. In the first seven months of this year, Ontario factories shipped fifty-four billion dollars worth of manufactured goods, an amount almost equal to the total production of all the other provinces of Canada. In addition to that, the growth rate of Ontario's factory shipments outpaced

inflation, and outpaced the growth rate of all other provinces except for Alberta and Saskatchewan.

I have to tell you, Stuart Smith notwithstanding, that's a long way from tenth and last. Ontario's economy, despite the pronouncements of the detractors and the doom sayers, has a broad and responsive industrial base that is in an excellent position to face the challenges of the eighties.

For the colleges, that means good news for these interesting times. At the same time, I think we all have to have very real concerns about funding of post-secondary education in all of its entities.

Until this point in time, the funding restraints which have been imposed upon the entire government, and upon all of the emanations of government, and all of the areas for which government has funding responsibility -- have really been absorbed without government intervention into the structure and function of the emanations specifically, and certainly without serious damage to the objectives of the institutions.

Unhappily, we now have to face the uncertainties and the threatening implications of changes in Established Program Financing. I will confess to you that we have not been notified of the Federal Government's official position. We may not be so notified until the Budget is announced or, indeed, until after the Budget is announced.

We, like you, have been subjected to the waves of rumours which I believe are deliberately leaked out of Ottawa on a daily basis, in order to keep everyone off guard. We have been subjected, like you, to ranges of figures from 1.5 billion to 11 billion dollars.

No one knows what's happening. There are times when I wonder whether Allan MacEachan knows what's happening. But it leaves us in a difficult, precarious and uncomfortable position right at this time.

That should disturb you as much as it does me -- because it would cause tremendous dislocation in the post-secondary system, and has the potential to threaten everything we have worked for in this province. It most certainly threatens the province's responsibility and right to establish policies and priorities in education within its own jurisdiction.

Gerald Regan's delightful new line that all of the rumours are in fact Tory originated propaganda delights me -- because if that's what they are, then obviously Allan MacEachan will not accept any of them, and we shall be left alone.

In this atmosphere, while we've been barraged with statements from Federal Ministers, Federal officials who quietly say to newspaper reporters that there are going to be transfer reductions, and that there will indeed be strong interventions directly into our post-secondary

system.

We're also on the receiving end of a flurry of Federal reports. I'm sure all of you have read them. The three that are most significant include Employment Opportunities for the Eighties; the Allmand Report, (which recommends every conceivable response that has been proposed over the last two decades to address labour market problems), the Fiscal Federalism in Canada Report, and the Grough Report (which agrees with the provincial position that there should not, in fact, be a reduction in the Established Programs Financing system).

That, of course, was developed in response to the task force that produced Labour Market Development in the 1980's, or the Dodge Report -- which, I think, really is probably the most significant, and most important of the three. As you know, that Report supports the widely held view that anticipated demographic, economic and technological change will have profound implications for Canada in the eighties and through the nineties.

The Ministry of Colleges and Universities in Ontario is in general agreement with the overall objectives outlined in that Report. But we disagree vigorously -- with the strong suport of every other minsitry with equal responsibilities in Canada -- about many of the specific measures proposed, because some of those measures will conflict directly with the effective running and management of the provincial educational/training system.

It would appear on careful perusal of the Dodge Report that, indeed, the proposals were made without any regard to the fit which must occur between the various components of our post-secondary system -- and it's that fit that we in the Ministry are studying at the present time.

We've established a Steering Committee which is Chaired by Phil Adams, whom you all know. The Committee is examining very closely a number of documents, reports and responses to reports, in order to formulate policies which will, I hope, be made public very late this year or early next year. Amongst those studies is a major study of growth in the community colleges which I believe you have received, at least in the interim stage, during this conference.

The three Federal reports that I mentioned are included, as are the Ministry Reports on Polytechnic Education and the Third System, the Continuing Education System as well as the very important document prepared by the Committee on the Future Role of Universities.

As I said, all of those papers plus the reponses to those papers are being examined very carefully by the Ministry committee, and it will be establishing the basis of policy development of post-secondary education and the government's responsibility in that area in the very near future.

Our policy as a Ministry and as a Government with regard to post-secondary education in these interesting times must reflect the responsibility that we have to ensure that the objectives of the various educational components complement one another -- that, indeed, they fit together as a whole.

In the whole area of skills acquisition, it is important that all parts and components must be interwoven together, wherever such training is offered -- be it at the secondary or the post-secondary level, or in apprenticeship, the area of manpower training at whatever level it is provided, and within whatever institution, be it a business establishment or a community college, and education provided either within provincial institutions, or private institutions, or, indeed, provided by voluntary agencies.

One of our problems through the years has been that unnecessary, and false divisions and barriers have been created between the various components of education and training -- between the various kinds of program components, and between the levels of education.

I believe we're only now beginning to break down some of those cement block bulwarks that have been built up over the years.

In education and training we built a house with many rooms, but the doors leading from one room to another were

very often closed and, all too often, locked. We built up mind sets over the years because of a traditional development of each of the programs in total isolation from one another.

You know, one of the very real purposes of putting colleges and universities together with skills training, industrial training, manpower training -- whatever you want to call it -- within the umbrella of one Ministry, was an attempt to begin to bring together all of the components of education and training. If any of you know of any valid way in which they can really be separated, I would like you to tell me.

Unhappily, we have not been able, up to this point, to open all the doors in our house. A simple example which is evident at both the secondary school and college levels lies in those well-ingrained attitudes by which academic teachers continue to look down their noses at tech instructors. That's a short-sighted kind of peering, if I may call it that. Every person who grows up in Ontario should have the opportunity to understand that there is a wide range of careers available to him or her -- and that the choice need not be academically oriented. Acquistion of a degree or a diploma is not a pre-requisite to becoming a productive, useful and respectable citizen.

In spite of this academic vs. technical attitude, there is another problem at the college level which may

look as though it goes in the opposite direction. I'm a little concerned about this at the present time -- because I'm seeing that, at some colleges, the vigorous pursuit of high technology is leading some of us to think less than supportively about the traditional education portion of the community colleges' role.

I'm not suggesting to you that the colleges should ever emulate the universities in terms of the production of programs in the humanities or the arts. But there isn't any way in which a very skilled person can function effectively, or as effectively as he or she might, unless he or she has some capability in communication, some understanding of the relative history of not only their community, their province, their country, and the world, but some relevant history of the area in which they're going to function as well.

They will never be effective members of society unless they know something about the ways in which they can improve their inter-personal relationships -- and thereby improve their own capabilities and productivity, as well as that of the instituiton or the area in which they work.

Those programs related to the humanities and arts, have a vital role to play in any kind of course at the college level, including short courses. I don't think we should forget that important part of our responsibilities.

What we're really trying to do in the technology oriented programs, which our colleges are now famed for producing, is to help human beings to develop skills so that the product which we produce, the students that we train, become fully functional human beings with marketable skills.

We have to keep the doors open throughout the entire system to ensure that those human beings will be able to take advantage of the opportunities as they are using their skills during their lifetime. We must always be sure that we are concentrating on the development of that human -- because if we don't educate at the same time as we train, we might just as well build robots. I'm sure that you would be as unhappy as I if our jurisdiction, or any other, were to begin to pursue that Orwellian kind of goal.

We are not building robots. We are teaching students, no matter what their age now, no matter what their age may be in the future. We have a major public responsibility to all the current students and the potential students of this province, be they eighteen or fifty.

Those of us who are elected or appointed are directly responsible to the public, and must discharge those responsibilities vigorously, with enthusiasm and with a high sense of our moral and ethical obligations. It is because I share those responsibilities with the Boards of

Governors that I have initiated my annual meetings with Chairmen of Boards.

I know that this is not always received with overwhelming enthusiasm by the Presidents of colleges. But I can tell you that I am going to continue that practice, because we share a responsibility at a level which is not, in fact, the level of responsibility of the Presidents.

I shall delight, of course, in meeting with ACAATO, with the Presidents, because we share responsibilities as well. But I do believe that the obligation to the public which the members of Boards and I share, is one which should be understood by all who are here and accepted as a fact of life. Regular dialogue has proved invaluable to me in the past, and I'm sure it will be in the future.

We have the most challenging role of any part of our society at this time in human history.

We have the capacity, it seems to me -- if not all the wherewithall we'd like like to have -- to meet the challenges which are in front of us.

Not one of us can do it alone. No part of education is an island separated from all the rest. We must work together.

What we are hoping to do within our combined ministries -- and with your assistance -- is to ensure that the ideal of education and training as a continuum --

that the ideal of education and training as a continuum -- lifelong learning -- becomes the norm for all the people of the province of Ontario.

If we can manage that, there isn't any doubt in my mind that there will be no place on earth that anyone would rather be.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

DEC 2 1983